DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 689 HE 002 296

AUTHOR	Bussis, Anne M.
TITLE	Report on the Revision of the NASSP Secondary-School Record.
INSTITUTION	Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
REPORT NO	PR-71-7
PUB DATE	May 71
NOTE	128p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Performance, *College Bound Students, *College High School Cooperation, *Communications, Higher Education, Information Needs, *Student Characteristics, *Student Records
IDENTIFIERS	*Secondary School Record

ABSTRACT

The Secondary School Record and its accompanying Personality Record (published by the National Association of Secondary School Principals) had been widely used for communicating information to colleges about a student's academic record, personal characteristics, interests, activities and other achievements. In 1962, it was decided that a complete revision of the form was needed to assure better communication of information between high schools and colleges. This report discusses: (1) the basic rationale of the revision; (2) the initial studies of the old form which led to the first experimental revision; (3) local pretesting of the first revision and development of the second experimental revision; (4) review and national pretesting of the second revision; (5) development of the final specifications for the revised forms; and (6) suggestions for future research and development. The forms used in the various revisions are included in the appendices. (AF)

ED052689

PR-71-7

REPORT ON THE REVISION OF THE NASSP SECONDARY-SCHOOL RECORD

Anne M. Bussis

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Project was conducted during the period September 1962-March 1964 by the Developmental Research Division of Educational Testing Service under contract with the National Association of Secondary-School Principals.

The present report describing the project was submitted to the contracting association in 1965, prior to initiation of the ETS Project Report (PR) series of publications. It is being printed now primarily for the purpose of historical documentation.

May, 1971

HE 002 296

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1.	Introduction	1
2.	Basic Rationale of the New Form	4
3.	Initial Studies of the Problem	9
4.	Local Pretest of the First Experimental Revision	17
5.	Review of the Second Experimental Revision	23
6.	The National High School Pretest	26
7.	The National College Pretest	40
8.	Completion of the Final Revision	50
9.	The Communications Study	53
10.	Suggestions for Future Research and Development	58
11.	References	61

12. Appendices:

A. The 1958 Edition of the Secondary School Record

B. The First Experimental Revision

C. The Second Experimental Revision

D. The 1964 Edition of the Secondary School Record

E. Content Analysis of 1360 Personality Records

F. Analysis of Selected Questions from a College Survey on Admissions Intangibles

G. Interview with High School Teachers and Counselor Re. Student SM

H. List of Participating Schools in the National High School Pretest Study

I. High School Counselor Questionnaire Analysis

J. Teacher Comments Regarding the Descriptive Scales

K. List of Participating Institutions in the National College Pretest Study

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D.)

L. Description of the Sample in the National College Pretest

M. Reactions of Admissions Officers in the National College Pretest

N. Interview Guide for the Communications Study

1. INTRODUCTION

Revision of the Secondary School Record was undertaken as a developmental project to meet the immediate and pressing need for better communication of information between high schools and colleges. The purpose of this report is to explain the basic rationale of the revision, discuss the various phases of the project and evolution of the revised forms, present the results of major data analyses, and suggest follow-up research.

For several years prior to its revision, the Secondary School Record and its accompanying Personality Record (published by the National Association of Secondary School Principals) was the most widely used standard form for communicating information to colleges about a student's academic record, personal characteristics, interests, activities, and other achievements. As the task of transmitting information from secondary schools to colleges became increasingly complex, however, the committee sponsoring this form became increasingly concerned about its adequacy. This sponsoring committee--the Joint Committee on School-College Relations of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO)--decided early in 1962 that a complete revision of the form was needed, and Educational Testing Service was commissioned to do the job. Work on the project began in the fall of 1962, with initial emphasis on the "Personality Record."

As a developmental undertaking, the project drew on many diverse sources for ideas and recommendations--(1) psychological and measurement theory; (2) educational literature analyzing various aspects of the school-to-college transition problem; (3) empirical data from questionnaire surveys and other related studies; and (4) the advice of teachers, principals, counselors, and admissions officers. The importance of this last source cannot be overestimated.

Major results of the study and successive revisions of the form were submitted for review to the Joint Committee on School-College Relations of NASSP and AACRAO at every stage of the project. This advisory committee, under the chairmanship of Eugene S. Wilson, provided not only general guidance but invaluable concrete assistance in its thoughtful criticism, constructive suggestions, and active participation in carrying out various phases of the work. In addition to the contributions of the advisory committee, scores of teachers, counselors and admissions officers throughout the country gave significant aid to the project by their participation in pretest studies. Educational Testing Service is deeply indebted to all of these persons for their cooperation and help.

Because the revision evolved in stages, this project is not well suited to the conventional research report format in which there is a "statement of the problem"; "review of the literature"; "description of research method"; and so forth. Indeed, there was no single problem or single study, but a series of each. This is not to say that the project grew like Topsy, but that it was necessarily sensitive to new problems and requirements which became clearly defined only in light of various advisory committee discussions and personal interviews with counselors and admissions officers. Pretest studies were designed and carried out as successive revisions of the form were completed; and in turn, each successive revision was based on results from the preceding pretest study. Thus, it seems more appropriate to follow an historical approach in this report, describing various phases of the project as it unfolded.

First, we will focus on the basic philosophy or rationale that was formulated very early in our thinking and that guided all subsequent work. Then

each successive phase of the project will be described--initial studies of the old form which led to the first experimental revision, local pretesting of the first revision and development of the second experimental revision, review and national pretesting of the second revision, and development of final specifications for the revised form. The last chapter will outline a "model" communications study (which was carried out only on a very limited scale in this project) and suggest other needed follow-up research on the new revision.

2. BASIC RATIONALE OF THE NEW FORM

What should a secondary school record do? What are the characteristics of a "good" record? . . . It was necessary to answer these questions before proceeding with any logical analysis or revision of the form.

We assumed that a student, during his years in high school, conveys by his behavior a vast array of information and impression to those around him--teachers, counselors, and principal. Out of this profusion of information and impression, that which is significant must be selected, condensed, and accurately communicated to those who will bear responsibility for his continued intellectual and personal growth. It is this communications job that is the proper function of a secondary school record. The record is a primary communications channel between high school and college. Thus, the revision task was approached from a communications framework.

From this framework, a number of relevant factors concerning the conditions that surround the school-to-college communications system were considered. With respect to the national scene, we made the following assumptions about these conditions:

(1) Lack of first-hand knowledge and personal contact characterize the situation. The college admissions officer cannot be intimately acquainted with all the high schools from which his candidates come; and likewise, the counselor cannot be familiar with all the colleges to which students apply. Even within the high school there is often lack of acquaintance, as the sheer weight of numbers makes it virtually impossible for the principal or counselor to know every student well.

(2) Responsibility for the admissions decision rests with the college. The high school lacks adequate knowledge for making such a decision, and responsibility cannot reasonably be thrust upon it by such procedures as having the counselor rank candidates or make discriminating predictions about their success at a particular higher educational institution.

(3) Colleges differ in their academic and social environments and have different criteria for making admissions decisions.

Admittedly, not all of these assumptions can be applied appropriately to every school and college, but in general they do seem an accurate representation of the national school-to-college transition picture. Given these assumptions, the essential properties of a "good" communications channel are fidelity and utility.

Fidelity, or accurate communication, is the first and foremost requirement of a secondary school record form. The high school has some collective "picture" of a student which it transfers onto a record. To the extent that the admissions officer can accurately reconstruct that "picture," the record has fidelity as a communications instrument.

Osgood (7) has pointed out that fidelity and reliability are not the same thing; a communications system can conceivably have almost perfect reliability and little fidelity. The term "reliability," however, is frequently used to specify an essential property of a psychological instrument. Often it is misused or irrationally applied--particularly in connection with behavioral rating scales. It has been suggested, for example, that such scales must be "reliable" in the sense that every teacher marks a student the same way. It would seem equally sensible to suggest that a grading scale is reliable only if every teacher gives a student the same mark. Just as a student's academic performance may well vary from one course to another, other aspects of his performance may also vary. He may be an inquisitive, challenging student in English class and not in history class. He may pursue independent study in mathematics and not in French. An instrument that obscures the true picture of a student's variability or consistency, as seen by his teachers, is an instrument of low fidelity.

To make the point a slightly different way, almost every admissions officer will insist upon an academic transcript showing grades earned in each course during successive years of high school. The picture of consistency (or lack of it) revealed by such a transcript is an important piece of information for the admissions officer. Likewise, a personality summary should reveal the same significant picture of degree of consistency with which teachers view a student. From a communications standpoint, then, "reliability" in terms of teacher agreement about a student is not considered an essential or even desirable feature for the Secondary-School Record.

What <u>is</u> necessary for high fidelity communication is an instrument that uses a standard vocabulary and clear, unambiguous terms. Clarity and agreement about the meaning of terms are features we have attempted to build into the revised Secondary-School Record. A series of "communication studies" was conducted during the pretesting of the new forms. Results of these studies were analyzed subjectively for the purpose of this project rather than by statistical techniques. Despite obvious difficulties in condensing the results for presentation, however, this type of study is considered an "ideal" criterion for judging the accuracy with which the Secondary-School Record communicates information and thus satisfies its primary requirement.

<u>Utility</u>, or <u>useful communication</u>, is another major requirement of a secondary school record. The information communicated by the record must be of value in facilitating decisions about a student.

From the viewpoint of decision making theory (2), the value of an instrument lies in its ability to provide information which leads to a "correct" decision. This value--or <u>utility</u>--may or may not be related to the instrument's <u>validity</u>. For example, a test with a given validity coefficient

may have different utilities, depending upon its relevance to the decision being made and the extent to which it contributes independent information. An instrument will have high utility if it contributes information that is essential to the decision and not available from any other source.

In terms of our present state of technology, however, it is extremely difficult to obtain an adequate measure of the "correctness" of admissions decisions. Certainly, "correctness" depends upon many factors above and beyond the grades which students earn at an institution; and, as illustrated by the work of Davis in the College Student Characteristics Study (3,4), these factors differ somewhat from one college campus to the next. The "highly desirable" student at Reed is not necessarily the "highly desirable" student at Northwestern. Exploration of those characteristics above and beyond academic performance which college faculty view as "desirable" has just begun, but the complexity of developing acceptable criterion measures of this kind is already well recognized. It eventually may be possible to determine the relationship between personal characteristics information on the Secondary-School Record and measures of "desirability" in college, but such a study was clearly beyond the time scope of this project. Because of these difficulties in determining the ultimate "correctness" of admissions decisions, we have used the term "utility" to mean the degree to which a communications instrument facilitates decision making by allowing the admissions officer to "see" important differences between students.

In a recent article written before the revised Secondary-School Record was published, Critchfield and Hutson (1) suggest that the purpose of the personality rating scales in the old form is to predict college grades. We would take sharp issue with this assumption. The prediction of college grades

from high school grades and test scores has reached a relatively high level of accuracy--probably higher than is commonly realized. There have been numerous attempts to raise this level significantly by including some measure of personality, but as pointed out by Joshua Fishman (6) such attempts have proved singularly unsuccessful for a number of reasons. Moreover, from the standpoint of an instrument's utility, there is little to be gained by attempting to duplicate predictive information already available from another source.

In order to satisfy the utility requirement, the Secondary-School Record should be a flexible instrument that is capable of communicating significant differences that exist between high schools and between students. With respect to personality information, it should permit the admissions officer to differentiate students on the basis of behavioral characteristics. With respect to academic information, it should allow the admissions officer to distinguish important differences between schools in their policies, grading practices and curricula.

3. INITIAL STUDIES OF THE PROBLEM

Beginning emphasis of the project was on revising the Personality Record, a copy of which appears in Appendix A. The first section of this form consists of eight rating scales on which teachers, along with the counselor or principal, make global evaluations about a student. The remainder of the form is filled out only by the counselor or principal and deals primarily with four open-ended questions: (a) significant school activities and special interests or abilities; (b) significant limitations; (c) additional information which may be helpful, such as probable financial needs or work experience; and (d) the principal's comments and recommendations.

Inspection of the form reveals that the rating scales are inadequately defined and ambiguous. The Motivation scale, for example, is defined by such terms as "Purposeless," "Vacillating," "Usually Purposeful," and "Highly Motivated." In some cases, the terms used to define a scale have little relationship to each other, thus making the scale multidimensional. The Initiative scale illustrates this point since it is defined at one end by the term "conforms" and at the other end by the term "creative."

In additi , some scales do not represent the kind of evaluation a teacher would necessarily make in the normal course of events. That is they deal with evaluations which are not essential to the teaching function and for which the teacher may have had little opportunity to observe relevant behavior. Leadership and Emotional Stability are examples of this type of scale. Where a teacher does make such an evaluation, it is probably only with respect to extreme cases. While it is likely that a teacher will take mental note of the extremely unstable youngster, for instance, it is highly unlikely that he would attempt to evaluate all students on some kind of "emotional stability" continuum.

Content Analysis

In order to study the Personality Record further, a content analysis was made of 1360 forms from the freshman class files of four diverse institutions: Amherst, Rutgers, The University of Michigan, and Women's College of the University of North Carolina. In all cases, the student's name was blocked out so that the forms were unidentifiable. The sample included students from a total of 31 states, but the majority of forms came from schools in New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Michigan, and Virginia. Complete results of this content analysis are presented in Appendix E.

The most important conclusions about use of the form yielded by the analysis were as follows. (1) Incomparable rating scale summaries: over a third of the forms showed only one unspecified checkmark on each scale, while the rest showed multiple checks or numbers. In the case of an unspecified check, it is impossible to tell whether this represents an average of several ratings or whether it is the single rating of a counselor or teacher. Rating summaries were also incomparable in that the scales were treated as discrete or continuous with about equal frequency. (2) Incomparable factual information about activities: although the record asks about participation in school activities, a considerable number of forms listed outside activities. Likewise, there was no uniformity in specifying either a student's function in an activity or the length of time he had participated. (3) Wasted space: omissions or an indication of "none" were found on most of the forms for the "Significant Limitations" and "Additional Information" questions. (4) General, nonanalytic statements: about one-fifth of the principal's comments were classified as very general statements. This is probably a gross underestimate

of the actual number of essentially meaningless recommendations, since the criterion for inclusion in this category was rather strict. The criterion required that the recommendation or comment state absolutely nothing about the characteristics or qualifications of the candidate (e.g., "Will do well," "Recommended with pleasure," etc.).

College Questionnaire Analysis

In January of 1960, a questionnaire concerning "Admissions Intangibles" was sent by Mr. Dale E. Remaly (Dean of Students, Horace Greeley High School, Chappaqua, New York) to a random sample of approximately 200 colleges and universities. Returns were received from 169 institutions. Mr. Remaly's immediate purpose in preparing this questionnaire was to gather information for a panel discussion, in which he was participating, at the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors convention. Once he received the unexpectedly high percentage of returns, however, Remaly found that he had neither the time nor necessary facilities to do an extensive analysis of his data. Educational Testing Service was informed about this questionnaire survey and we were kindly provided with the data.

A description of the college sample and tabulated results from selected questionnaire items are given in Appendix F. Of particular interest for the revision project were the colleges' overwhelming indication that: (1) they will need more personal characteristics information as candidates become increasingly acceptable in terms of academic qualifications; (2) they expect to obtain such additional information from the high school rather than from other sources such as personal interviews or alumni reports; and (3) they feel that characteristics of "drive and ambition" are the most important nonintellective traits for success in college. Finally, it was noted that colleges do

not want just more information from high schools, but they feel the need for more specific information.

Proposed Criteria for the Revision

From inspection of the form and the content analysis, certain obvious revision needs were indicated--more descriptive and less ambiguous scales; better instruction on rating procedures; better specification of what factual information is wanted in order to insure greater comparability of information; and better direction to counselors about the kinds of analytic comments that are wanted. In addition to these general needs, the following were proposed as specific criteria for a revised form:

The form should deal with characteristics that are capable of definition in terms of normally observable behavior. While this criterion does not limit the form to sheer "reporting," it does require that traits or characteristics be illustrated by examples of behavior. Information about very complex psychological variables ("Maturity" for example) should be inferred from patterns of more simple, behaviorally defined traits (self-direction in making decisions, independent judgment, the assumption of personal responsibility for one's own actions, and so forth). The criterion also specifies that teachers be asked to provide information only about behavioral traits they would normally have an opportunity to observe in the classroom.

The rating scales should be discrete rather than continuous. As far as could be determined, rating scale data are not treated statistically as equal interval measures by the admissions officer, but are subjectively weighed in some way so as to rank candidates. The problem, then, is one of providing the most meaningful descriptive information possible, while at the same time insuring against "too fine" and unjustified discriminations between students. The

provision of discrete rather than continuous rating scales should be a safeguard against such unjustified discriminations.

The scales should be defined by cues of sufficient length to describe behavior adequately. In order to facilitate greater consistency in scale use, teachers must be able to agree about the meaning of the scale descriptions. Longer and more descriptive cues than appeared on the old form are needed to do this, since the requirement of short phrases or one-word cues almost inevitably results in the use of ambiguous terms. Also undesirable is the use of normative terms such as "below average," "average," and "above average," since it is extremely difficult to provide any reasonably standard frame of reference for making and interpreting such normative judgments.

Scales should provide a "No opportunity to observe" category. Where there is reasonable doubt that a teacher will have had adequate opportunity to observe the particular behavior in question, such a category should be built into the scale. It is meaningless to force an individual to make a judgment for which he has little or no evidence.

Content for a Revised Form

Three sources of information were utilized in deciding upon specific content for the revised form: Dale Remaly's college questionnaire data; articles on college admissions that have appeared in the educational literature; and data on "desirable student characteristics" from the College Student Characteristic Study conducted at ETS (3,4). These three sources yielded surprisingly similar results. There appear to be certain areas of "nonacademic" information which most admissions officers regard as important. Without going into much detail about each one, these areas may be generally identified as follows:

(1) Motivation--at least two distinct concepts seem to be involved in this area. One is the concept of extrinsic motivation and such related behaviors as perseverance, drive, willingness to work hard, desire to get good grades, etc. The other concept relates more to intrinsic motivation and such factors as intellectual curiosity, the desire to learn, and interest.

(2) Intellectual Maturity--independent thinking and a sense of responsibility for one's work are key factors here.

(3) Social Maturity--this refers to a social concern and sensitivity to the rights and feelings of other people.

(4) Interest Development--colleges are concerned not only about a student's breadth of interests, but also depth of achievement in the area of greatest interest.

(5) Leadership--as stated by Albert Dickerson (5), this means not only "the usual indications of leadership and drive . . . but the quiet individualists whose strength and influence will first begin to show later, in more mature environments, perhaps even after college."

(6) Strengths and Weaknesses--colleges would like a thoughtful analysis of the student's strong and weak points.

(7) Special Information--of concern in this area are significant or limiting health factors, emotional factors, social adjustment factors, and so forth.

The First Experimental Revision

The first experimental revision of the Personality Record consisted of two forms (see Appendix B): the Teachers Evaluation Form consisting of 16 behavioral rating scales on which teachers were asked to rate students; and the Personal Characteristics Report, a first version of the actual transcript to be sent from the high school to colleges which included both the counselor's evaluation of the student and a summary of various teachers' ratings of the student. In addition, there was a Manual for the Teachers Evaluation Form containing detailed descriptions of each of the sixteen rating scales.

As can be seen upon inspection of these forms, an attempt was made to include all of the revision needs indicated by the content analysis and to

meet the specific criteria (such as less ambiguous and discrete rating scales) mentioned above. At this point, however, no attempt was made to be selective in content, and all of the content areas of interest to colleges were included.

Specifically, Part I of the Personal Characteristics Report attempted to elicit from the counselor specific information and analytic comments concerning aspects of intellectual and social maturity, interest development, leadership, and strengths and weaknesses. In Part II of the form, the rating scales were arranged in such a way as to facilitate the most meaningful interpretation of ratings. For this part it was necessary to prepare an Admissions Officer's Manual discussing how patterns of specific behavior (as revealed in the scale ratings) might indicate more global psychological characteristics. For example, the first six scales were intended to shed light on such factors as degree of motivation for academic work and whether the motivation was more extrinsic or intrinsic in nature. Likewise, to assess something about the degree of overall maturity, various indications of independence could be evaluated against willingness to accept personal responsibility for one's own actions.

These materials (the Teachers Evaluation Form and Manual, the Personal Characteristics Report, and the Admissions Officer's Manual) and the rationale for them, together with plans for a local pretesting study, were presented to the Joint Committee on School-College Relations of NASSP and AACRAO at their meeting, January 6-8, 1963. In general, the committee approved of the work, giving particularly enthusiastic endorsement to the basic philosophy or "approach" of the new form--i.e., the viewpoint that high school teachers and counselors should be asked mainly to describe behaviors which they have an opportunity to observe; and that evaluation of these behaviors (the inference

of more global psychological traits from various behavior patterns) should be left to the admissions officer. The committee decided that ETS should complete the local pretesting study, prepare a second experimental revision, and present this revision to a meeting of representatives of various educational organizations on May 10, 1963.

4. LOCAL PRETEST OF THE FIRST EXPERIMENTAL REVISION

The new materials were pretested in comparison with the old Personality Record in a sample of five high schools and three colleges from the nearby New Jersey - Pennsylvania - New York area. Participating institutions were: Cheltenham High School, Horace Greeley High School, New Brunswick High School, New Rochelle High School, Princeton High School, Rutgers University, Trenton State College, and the University of Pennsylvania.

The High School Evaluation and Data Analyses

At each of four high schools, the counselor was asked to pick four senior students with academic records that would make them reasonably eligible scholastically as candidates for one of the three colleges in the study. The final sample of 16 students consisted of six students who, in reality, were applying to Rutgers, four who are applying to an Ivy League college, and six who were applying elsewhere and whose college choice was simply indicated as "College X" on the "Specific Recommendation" section of the forms.

For each student, five teachers filled out the rating scales of the old form and the new descriptive rating scales. The student's counselor then completed the Personality Record and the Personal Characteristics Report and attached an academic transcript to each form. Teachers and counselors were asked to submit comments, criticisms, and suggestions for further revision of the experimental form after they had completed their respective tasks. These comments and suggestions were later analyzed and proved most valuable in preparing the second experimental revision.

The teachers were also asked to evaluate each rating scale, indicating a question mark (?) beside any scale they felt was ambiguous or had been difficult

to use meaningfully in describing a student. A marking of "OK" was indicated for scales which were considered both unambiguous and meaningful. While a total of 60 teachers participated in the study, submitting comments and suggestions, the rating scale evaluations were completed sufficiently for data analysis in only 35 cases. A significance test[1] was run for differences between the old scales and revised scales in percent of "ambiguous" evaluations given by teachers (N=35). The difference was highly significant ($p = < .0005$ for a one-tailed test) in favor of the revised scales. This statistically significant difference was well substantiated by the teachers' free response comments. Overwhelmingly, the teachers expressed feelings that they were "more at home with these rating scales"; that they could "make ratings with greater confidence"; or that they had "more evidence to bring to the rating."

When the two forms for each student were returned, 8 students were selected at random and a content analysis was made of the information provided on the old Personality Record and the Personal Characteristics Report. Specifically, the content analysis was focused on questions of the specificity of information given and what information was unique or common to the forms.

At the fifth high school (Horace Greeley High School) the design was altered somewhat in order to obtain data for a time study. Two groups of teachers were selected (N=3, and N=5). In each group teachers were asked to rate the same students, using the revised set of rating scales. Group I rated one student per day for three days and Group II rated one student per day for five days. On the last day, the teachers noted the time required to

---

[1]The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test was used. "d" scores were the (% ambiguous old form scales) - (% ambiguous new form scales).

fill out the revised scales. They then completed the old form rating scales (with which they were already familiar) for this last student and noted the time required to do this task. The comparison showed little difference in the time required to use the two sets of scales--even though the revised scales were greater in number and accompanied by a Manual of detailed descriptions.

After three days' practice, Group I reported an average time of nine minutes to fill out the new scales and 9.6 minutes for the old scales. (This unusually long time may be explained by the fact that the student they were rating was a most complex and controversial young person.) After five days' practice, Group II reported an average time of 3.4 minutes for the revised scales and 3.1 minutes for the old scales. It was concluded that the addition of more scales with more detailed descriptions would not significantly lengthen the time factor involved in the teacher's filling out the scales.

The College Evaluation

From the sample of students for whom we had a completed Personality Record, Personal Characteristics Report, and academic record, four "interesting" students were selected for the college study. Mock "official transcripts" for these students (identified only by initial) were sent to six admissions officers, two from each of the participating institutions. The design for the study specified that each admissions officer receive a Personality Record for two of the students and a Personal Characteristics Report for the other two. The academic transcript was attached for all students. Specifically, the design called for the preparation of two "official transcript" folders. Although both folders contained transcripts for the same students, they varied as follows with respect to the forms used:

Student	Folder #1	Folder #2
SM	old form	revised form
NB	revised form	old form
RL	old form	revised form
SW	revised form	old form

Both folders were sent to each institution, but the assignment of a #1 or #2 folder to the admissions officers within an institution was random. Each admissions officer was instructed to study his folder and be prepared to discuss the hypothetical applicants in an interview session. He was also asked to make criticisms and suggestions about the revised form.

Individual taped interview sessions of approximately an hour to an hour and a half were held with each admissions officer. During each of these interviews, a concentrated effort was made to "pin down" the admissions officer and get him to interpret as much as he possibly could about the characteristics of the students--their motivation, maturity, leadership, and so on. A random order was assigned to the discussion of applicants, so that no man discussed the students in the same order. Since there was no official decision being made, the officers were encouraged to "go out on a limb" in their interpretations and cull as much as possible from the information they had available.

These interviews provided basic data for the communications study to be described in the next section. In addition, however, they yielded helpful criticisms and suggestions for the second revision and invaluable insight into how admissions officers use and interpret certain information. One conclusion that seemed quite clear from this study was that the main information communicated by the rating scales in the old form was whether or not teachers "liked" a student. Rarely did an admissions officer take the trait name of one of the

old rating scales at face value and conclude anything about a student's "motivation," or "industriousness" or "emotional stability." Rather, if the ratings tended to cluster at the right end (favorable end) of the scale, they concluded that teachers "liked" the student. If they tended to cluster at the left (unfavorable end), they concluded that teachers tended to "dislike" the student. And if they clustered in the middle the conclusion was drawn that the student left little impression on his teachers!

The Communications Study

After interviews at the colleges were completed, we again contacted the high schools from which the four hypothetical applicants had been selected. Appointments were made to interview the teachers who had filled out the rating scales for each student as well as the counselor of the student. Some interviews were conducted as group sessions, with all of the teachers being present. In other cases, this was impossible and teachers were interviewed in smaller groups or individually.

The purpose of these interviews was to obtain as vivid a picture as possible of how the high school viewed the student--his characteristics of motivation, maturity, leadership, and so on. The teachers and counselors were most spontaneous and articulate in their comments, and this type of interview procedure was considered highly successful. Many teachers said that it had been quite helpful to hear the comments of others and expressed the feeling that, though time consuming, such an interview would be a much more "real" way of describing students to colleges.

The point of the communications study was to assess the fidelity of the Personal Characteristics Report as a communications channel in comparison with the old Personality Record. Were admissions officers able to get a truer

picture of how the high school viewed the student from one form as opposed to the other? To assess the fidelity of the communications channel, an analysis was made of the correspondence between the high school's collective "picture" and the college's "picture" of the student. Three college interpretations or "pictures" of each student were available from the old Personality Record (one from each institution) and three from the revised form. The interview data were culled to compare key high school statements with key statements made by admissions officers using different forms.

The general conclusion of this analysis was that the revised form did provide for somewhat greater fidelity of communication in all areas. Particularly outstanding, however, was the greater accuracy of communication with respect to characteristics of academic motivation and intellectual curiosity. Because this analysis was subjective (based on inspection of the data) and not statistical, it is extremely difficult to condense the results for presentation. To provide a "feel" for the valuable nature of this type of study, however, a tape was made of selected key portions of a high school interview and then selected key portions of interviews with three admissions officers--two viewing the students from the revised form and one from the old form. This tape was presented at a May conference of educators who reviewed the progress of the project. A transcript of the high school portion of that tape is presented in Appendix G.

On the basis of information gathered during the local pretest, a second experimental revision of the form was prepared in May.

5. REVIEW OF THE SECOND EXPERIMENTAL REVISION

The second experimental revision, based upon results of the local pretest, was presented for review at a special meeting sponsored by the NASSP and held at ETS on May 9-10, 1963. The meeting was attended by representatives of several national educational organizations concerned with various aspects of school to college transition. Materials comprising this second experimental revision were two forms and a manual (see Appendix C).

(1) The Student Description Form (SDF) was a revised version of the Teachers Evaluation Form used in the local pretesting. Rather than 16 scales, however, this version contained 12 behavioral scales on which teachers were asked to rate students. The 12 scales retained in this form were: Participation in Discussions, Classroom Interest, Independent Work Interest, Evenness of Performance, Quantity of Work, Promptness, Independence of Judgment, Questioning Attitude, Depth of Understanding, Personal Responsibility, Respect for Others, and Friendliness.

(2) The Secondary-School Record was a second version of the actual transcript to be sent from the high school to colleges. Unlike the first form--the Personal Characteristics Report--this form contained the student's academic transcript as well as a summary of personal characteristics information. Specifically, the Record contained the following four sections:

> Page 1--Academic Record: This was changed little in content from the 1958 edition of the Secondary-School Record, but it was changed extensively in format. Most striking was the change from a vertical to a horizontal orientation. Rationale for this revision was an attempt to make the manually prepared form more compatible in format with the machine produced form received by the many high schools participating in the Cooperative Plan for Guidance and Admission.

Page 2--Summary of the Descriptive Rating Scales: Data received from the teachers on the SDF were transcribed on this page of the form.

Page 3--School Report: This page provided space for the recording of such factual information as school activities, honors and independent activities, work experience, educational interests, and health information. It also contained structured questions requesting the counselor's analytic comments on factors related to the student's achievement and other information indicative of outstanding personal traits or of the student's potential for intellectual and personal growth.

Page 4--Additional Information: An essentially unstructured page, allowing simply for the carry over of any information or comments from page 3, this section was intended to reduce the necessity for accompanying letters of explanation or other additional documents attached to the transcript.

(3) A Manual for high schools and colleges was prepared which gave some of the rationale and background of the revision; a description of its organization and content; detailed explanations of each of the twelve behavioral rating scales (to be used by teachers when filling out the SDF); and suggestions for interpretation and use of the descriptive rating information.

Presentation of these materials, of the communications rationale upon which they were based, and of data gathered during the local pretest study stimulated lively reactions from the educators assembled at the review conference. As had been true at the School and College Relations Committee meeting in January, interest focused particularly upon the communications philosophy of the project. The committee gave unanimous endorsement to plans for further study of the new materials and suggested two specific areas for further modification and revision. First, there was substantial feeling that the four-page Secondary School Report was too long and time consuming to be practical. The information about school activities was considered especially superfluous, since most college applications require a student to give a full

listing of his extracurricular activities. Thus, the committee urged that the Secondary School Record be pretested as a two-page form, as well as a four-page form.

Secondly, there was dissatisfaction expressed over the academic transcript part of the Record. As described above, this portion of the Record contained few content changes. It was not surprising, therefore, that several different views about specific content revisions were represented among the committee members. The colleges, of course, are primarily concerned with receiving accurate information about the ever-growing diversity of honors curricula and special courses, grading practices, and systems of weighting grades to compute a cumulative grade point average. The high school, on the other hand, is concerned mainly with a high degree of compatibility between a transcript form and its own cumulative record forms. Ideally, the Secondary School Record should be designed so as to fulfill the double purpose of a cumulative record and a transcript. Differences between high schools in policies and practices are so great, however, that there seems little likelihood of obtaining agreement upon a single cumulative record--at least in the immediate future. The committee concurred that a more feasible goal for the present would be to try to achieve a compromise in the academic transcript that would best accommodate both the high school's and the college's needs.

6. THE NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL PRETEST

The second experimental revision was pretested in a sample of 98 high schools in June, 1963. ETS is indebted to the American School Counselors' Association for making this pretest possible, as regional officials of the ASCA were instrumental in obtaining the cooperation of participating schools in their respective regions.

Objectives of this national high school pretest were threefold: (1) to obtain information on school policies and counselor attitudes pertinent to a revision of the academic transcript; (2) to obtain subjective reactions to the descriptive scales from counselors and teachers; and (3) to obtain empirical data on the intercorrelation of the scales and the time necessary to complete them.

It was specified that all students who were selected for inclusion in the study be second semester eleventh grade students in a college preparatory curriculum. In addition, the design called for the following breakdown within each region:

Design A -- In approximately $\frac{1}{2}$ of the schools per region, the Secondary School Record was pretested as a two-page form (academic transcript and summary of the descriptive scale ratings only). The counselor selected 10 students at random. All current teachers of these students filled out the rating scales of the Student Description Form (using the Manual definitions of each scale as a guide) and completed a questionnaire. The counselor summarized the descriptive scale ratings on the Secondary-School Record, filled out the academic transcript of the Record, and completed a questionnaire.

Design B -- Approximately of the schools per region completed the full four-page form of the Secondary School Record. Other procedures were identical to those specified in Design A, with the exception that counselors were asked to select only five students for inclusion in the study.

Design C -- In approximately of the schools, the counselor was asked to select from two to five teachers and have these teachers fill out Student Description Forms for all students in a class (approximately 20-30 students). It was specified that this job be carried out over at least a two-day period. Teachers were asked to indicate the time required to fill out the SDF for each of the first three students rated, and the time required for each of the last three students rated. The teachers also completed a questionnaire about the descriptive scales. The counselor then selected five students at random from among those who had been rated, and the remaining current teachers of these students completed a Student Description Form for the student. A summary of the descriptive ratings for each of these five students was transcribed on the appropriate page of the Secondary School Record. The counselor completed the academic transcript and filled out a questionnaire regarding this "short form" (two-page form) of the Secondary School Record.

Description of the Sample

A list of all schools included in the pretest sample appears in Appendix H. Of the 126 schools who originally agreed to participate in the pretest, a total of 98 actually completed the study. (Five schools, however, returned data rather late in the summer and were not included in all the analyses.) This substantial proportion of over 75% completions is especially

surprising when one considers the rush and inconvenience caused by the unavoidable late timing of the study--June of the school year. This fact, together with the observation that all participating schools had counselors who belonged to the ASCA, suggests a strong possibility that the sample was biased. The bias might be interpreted as one of "professionally-minded" counselors or "college-minded" communities, but in any case it seems clear that the schools were unusually cooperative in a study concerned with the problem of college transcript revision. In terms of geographic distribution, size of student body, and grade span (3, 4, or 5-6 year high schools), the sample was composed as follows:

STATE	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	ENROLLMENT*					GRADE SPAN*		
		0 - 500	501- 1000	1001- 1500	1501- 2000	Over 2000	3 Yrs.	4 Yrs.	5-6 Yrs.
CALIFORNIA	24	1	1	8	6	4	8	11	1
OREGON	17	4	3	6	1	2	3	13	0
MINNESOTA	13	4	2	4	2	1	6	1	6
MONTANA	4	1	2	0	0	1	1	3	0
MASSACHUSETTS	4	1	1	2	0	0	1	2	1
NEW YORK	16	0	4	3	1	5	0	11	2
NEW JERSEY	4	1	1	0	1	0	1	2	0
PENNSYLVANIA	5	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	1
VIRGINIA	11	1	2	3	3	0	1	5	3
TOTAL	98	13	16	27	15	14	23	48	14

*These figures obtained from U. S. Office of Education statistics. Because data were not available for 13 schools the total N is only 85.

School Policies and Practices

Certain questions on the counselor questionnaire pertained to general policies of the school and were answered only by one counselor at each school--presumably the one in charge of the pretest study. The questions were designed to yield information on the extent of use of the NASSP form, practices in reporting of test scores to colleges, methods of calculating course credit, policies on recommending students, and opinions about the routine reporting of student activities or other information generally requested by the college on its own application form. An analysis of the questionnaire results is presented below (N = 98 schools).

(1) Use of NASSP Secondary School Record vs. Own Transcript Form:

	N
NASSP Secondary School Record	37
Own Cumulative Record as Transcript	59
Other	2
	98

(2) Use of Pressure-Sensitive Test Score Labels on Transcript:

	N
Use Test Score Labels	43
Don't Use Test Score Labels	49
Omit	6
	98

(3) Use of Credits vs. Units in Calculating Course Credit:

	N
Credits	45
Units	47
Omit	6
	98

(4) Policy on Writing Statements of Recommendation for Students:

	N
In favor	63
Opposed	13
Neutral (no official policy)	22
	98

(5) Policy on Checking Statements of Recommendation for Students ("Recommended"; "Some Reservations"; "Not Recommended"; etc.):

	N
In favor	48
Opposed	22
Neutral (no official policy)	27
Omit	1
	98

(6) Opinion about Providing Information on the Student's Activities, Honors, and Work Experience (i.e., Information Generally Requested by the College on its own Application Form):

	N
In favor	71
Opposed	20
Split (counselor opinion split)	7
	98

At least three things of particular interest should be noted about this analysis. With respect to use of the NASSP form, many more eastern schools use the Secondary School Record than do western schools. When broken down into a regional analysis, less than 30% of the schools from California, Oregon, Minnesota, and Montana indicated use of the NASSP Record--while 75% of the schools from Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Virginia said that they did use the form. About 40% of the New York schools (these were mainly from the NYC area) indicated use of the NASSP form.

With respect to policies on recommending students and reporting of student activities and honors, the schools in the sample were in rather sharp contrast to opinions expressed at the May review meeting. While the arguments presented in May ranged on both sides of the recommendation issue, a rather persuasive case was presented for not having counselors evaluate students in written recommendations. Objective evidence from the initial study of the Personality Record tended to support this argument, since nearly one fifth of the recommendations had been classified as "very general non-analytic

statements." Further contact with admissions officers during the local pretest study also suggested that these recommendations were evaluated more in terms of the counselor's writing ability and judgment than in terms of the student's personal qualifications per se. Nonetheless, over 60% of the schools indicated that they favored the policy of writing recommendations.

Likewise, almost 70% indicated that they favored the policy of reporting routine information (such as student activities) which is generally requested on the college's application form. In May, however, there was virtually unanimous agreement that such information was unnecessary and a waste of time--from both the high schools' and colleges' point of view.

Counselor Reactions

The counselors of all students included in the study completed a questionnaire about their overall reactions to the new materials. Results of this questionnaire survey, based on data from 192 counselors in 93 schools, are generally quite favorable (see Appendix I). Over half of the counselors indicated that the descriptive scale information was "Very Valuable" for transcript purposes (58%) and would be "Very Useful" to have for all students for counseling or instructional purposes (54%). Only 3% and 6%, respectively, indicated it was "Not Very Valuable" and "Not Very Useful" for these purposes. As might be expected, fewer counselors (39%) felt that the new Secondary School Record would be a "Very Useful" transcript for employers.

It is interesting to note that a substantial majority of the counselors were in favor of providing a breakdown of the descriptive scale summary--even though this presumably would require more detailed work on the school's part than just presenting an overall summary. Specifically, they favored

the separate recording of descriptive ratings obtained (1) from different years, and (2) in honors or advanced placement courses. The questionnaire also revealed that the 192 counselors indicate personal agreement with their school policies on the matters of writing and checking recommendations for students and providing information usually asked for by the college on its own application form. This finding is difficult to interpret. On the one hand, it may reflect a considerable pressure for conformity among counselors in the schools sampled. (It should be noted that the questionnaires were not returned individually by each counselor. Rather, all data from the school were returned in a single package by the head counselor in charge of the study.) On the other hand, such a finding might reflect genuine agreement. If so, it would indicate that the strong arguments against recommending students (many supported by research evidence) are being voiced by an avant garde within the counseling profession and are not generally acknowledged at the grass roots level.

Finally, analysis was also made of comments and suggestions which counselors wrote on the back of their questionnaires. Many of these comments were very valuable for determining needed changes in the academic transcript. It was obvious, for one thing, that the horizontal format of the Record was not particularly popular--especially in those schools that did not have a long-carriage typewriter. Other noteworthy comments made by several of the counselors included the following:

> Need space for identifying honors, special courses, summer courses, etc. Not flexible enough to indicate different kinds of offerings.
>
> Need space or instructions for identifying full year vs. semester mark--also for $\frac{1}{2}$ year courses.
>
> Need more space for "Other Subjects" (health, art, music, business education, etc.)

Not enough space to explain "Special Weighting" in calculating rank in class.

Not enough subsections for some tests in Test Record section--also need space for special area scores.

Not enough space for entering total school test program--how far back should school list tests and which tests should they list?

No place for score labels.

Teacher Reactions

Naturally, the teacher's reactions were limited to the descriptive scales and did not constitute an appraisal of the entire Secondary School Record. In general, it can be seen from the questionnaire results presented below that teachers were quite favorably inclined to the new scales. These data are based on returns from 864 teachers.

High School Teacher Questionnaire Analysis

1. In general, how meaningful did you find the descriptive scales?

	N	%
very meaningful	478	55
somewhat meaningful	341	39
not very meaningful	24	3
can't say	13	2
omit	8	1

2. In general, are the new scales more meaningful than other scales on which you have been asked to rate students?

	N	%
more meaningful	583	67
same as other scales	137	16
less meaningful	7	1
can't say	127	15
omit	11	1

3. In general, do you think the task is difficult--i.e., would you have difficulty in deciding which scale category to mark for most students?

	N	%
great difficulty	16	2
some difficulty	408	47
little difficulty	430	50
omit	10	1

4. As a teacher, do you think it would be helpful to have this information (i.e., Student Description Forms) about your own incoming students?

	N	%
very helpful	321	37
of some help	413	48
not very helpful	114	13
omit	16	2

5. Do you feel any of the scales forced you to make an invalid or unfair evaluation of the student(s)?

	N	%
no	684	79
yes	139	16
omit	41	5

6. <u>In general</u>, was the Manual readable?

	N	%
yes	830	96
no	13	2
omit	21	2

7. Practically speaking, do you think you would use the Manual if you had to fill out Student Description Forms routinely, for every student in your classes?

	N	%
yes	491	57
no	329	38
omit	44	5

8. Practically speaking, which of the following arrangements do you think is preferable?

	N	%
form with smaller print, no manual	326	38
form as is, with manual	507	59
omit	31	4

Many teachers also volunteered comments and suggestions on the back of their questionnaires. While there are few general conclusions to be drawn from these comments, they do reflect the tremendous range of teacher knowledge, biases, opinions, and attitudes on the subject of rating scales. Because such data might be of interest to anyone studying teacher behavior in this area, a full summary of the comments has been included in Appendix J.

The Time Study

It will be remembered that teachers in Design C of the pretest were asked to rate all of the students in one class, indicating the time required to fill out the descriptive scales for each of the first three and each of the last three students rated. This rating procedure was to be carried out over a period of at least two days. A total of 58 teachers completed the task. Analysis of the data showed a significant decrease ($p < .01$) in time, with the first ratings taking an average of slightly over four minutes per student and the last ratings requiring an average of slightly under two minutes per student. As in the local pretest study, it was concluded that the Student Description Form is a practical instrument for the classroom since the scales do not require an inordinate amount of the teacher's time.

Intercorrelation of the Scales

With exception of the time study data described above, all other Student Description Forms (SDFs) were obtained in the following manner. The counselor in charge of the pretest at each school selected from five to ten college preparatory students in the 11th grade (supposedly at random) and then had the current teachers of these students fill out the descriptive scales. Each teacher also indicated the grade earned by the student in his course. A total of 2780 SDFs, completed according to this procedure, were returned for analysis.

For purposes of analysis, the data were quantified by giving the five discrete rating categories of each scale a numerical value from 5 to 1. In all cases, 5 was assigned to the category indicating the greatest strength or frequency of the behavior. (See Appendix C for a copy of the SDF.) Alternative categories for the scales--"Vacillates" or "No Opportunity to Observe"--

were assigned a value of 9. All SDFs on which there was a "9" rating or any scale omissions were excluded from the analysis. This left a total of 1968 "complete data" cases eligible for the intercorrelation study. The distribution of these SDFs by subject area of the teacher was as follows:

English	489
Foreign Language	304
Mathematics	268
Sciences	326
Social Studies	435
Communicative Arts	33
Fine Arts	10
Performing Arts	37
Home or Technical Arts	30
Industrial Arts	9
Commercial Subjects	23
No Indication of Subject	4
	1968

The distribution of course grades (which had been indicated by each rating teacher at the bottom of the SDF) revealed that the sample of students included in the study was extremely biased. This was true of the total sample of 2780 SDFs as well as the "complete data" sample. Thus, it was necessary to select cases for the intercorrelation study in such a way as to normalize the distribution of grades. This was accomplished by the following procedure:

Grade	Complete Data Sample N	%	Selection Procedure	Final Sample N	%
A+	40	40	every 4th case	10	20
A	737		every 4th case	184	
B+	110	38	every 3rd case	36	36
B	645		every 2nd case	322	
C+	54	17	all cases	54	34
C	284		all cases	284	
D+	10	05	all cases	10	10
D	77		all cases	77	
F	11		all cases	11	
	1968			988	

In order to determine relationships between the twelve descriptive scales and grade in class, intercorrelations were run for the final sample of 988 SDFs selected by the above procedure. Results of this analysis are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1

INTERCORRELATIONS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
FOR TWELVE RATING SCALES WITH GRADE IN CLASS
(N = 988)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	M	SD
Participation	1	--													3.458	1.098
Class Interest	2	(61)	--												3.852	0.906
Independent Work Interest	3	52	(69)	--											3.564	0.979
Evenness of Performance	4	34	51	54	--										3.778	0.902
Quantity of Work	5	48	(60)	(70)	(60)	--									3.376	0.880
Promptness	6	28	53	51	56	55	--								4.189	0.863
Independence of Judgment	7	(61)	54	59	32	46	31	--							3.483	1.080
Questioning Attitude	8	(69)	54	55	31	43	23	(73)	--						3.051	1.340
Depth of Understanding	9	56	58	(64)	47	59	37	(66)	(64)	--					3.450	0.948
Personal Responsibility	10	34	58	55	55	54	(64)	37	30	46	--				4.142	0.864
Respect for Others	11	24	50	42	38	43	46	27	20	37	59	--			4.092	0.992
Friendliness	12	37	38	31	20	29	28	29	28	29	37	48	--		4.186	0.727
Grade	13	46	51	56	51	(61)	46	45	43	59	42	24	15	--	2.702	0.926

Inspection of the data in Table 1 shows a fairly high level of relationship--as might be expected with this large an N and with students and teachers replicated within the data. Thus, the question of "How high is 'too high' a correlation?" cannot be answered by the usual significance tables or any statistical rule of thumb. At this point in the study, however, an arbitrary cut-off point was set at 60, and revision efforts concentrated on reducing those correlation coefficients in the 60's and 70's. Some scales with high

correlations were revised slightly in wording or content, while others were eliminated. In other words, the correlation coefficient was not the sole criterion for decisions to eliminate or retain a scale.

Of the 78 coefficients presented in Table 1, 13 are "too high" according to our definition. These are the circled coefficients in the table. Elimination of four scales in the final revision potentially reduces that ratio to five "high" correlations out of 36. (There is, of course, no way of determining the actual intercorrelations among the scales in the final revision without conducting a new study.) Scales that were eliminated are as follows:

Scale 5 - Quantity of Work: This scale was one of the worst offenders in total number of high correlations. Although the Manual definition stressed that the scale did not refer to quality of work but to sheer length and elaboration of assigned projects and extra work done for the class, it is obvious that teachers found it very difficult to separate this from indices of quality (as revealed by the high correlation with grades) and other indications of a certain type of motivation (i.e., class interest, and evenness of performance). The high correlation with Independent Work Interest may be explained by the fact that "extra work" appeared as part of the definition of both scales.

Scale 6 - Promptness: As can be seen from Table 1, this scale has the highest mean rating and very little variance. The rationale for including it as a behavior which would help distinguish motivational patterns was never as clear cut as for some of the other behaviors, and in subsequent interviews with admissions officers it was noted that this scale was invariably interpreted as a separate entity and not related to the other scales.

Scale 7 - Independence of Judgment: Although this is an important concept of intellectual maturity, it proved extremely hard to define in terms of observable behavior. Rather, it is something a teacher must infer from other factors such as a questioning attitude and depth of understanding. Because the cluster of these three variables (scales 7, 8, and 9) is highly intercorrelated, a decision was made to eliminate this scale and to try to lower the correlation between Questioning Attitude and Depth of Understanding by appropriate revision. In this way it was thought that the characteristic of independent judgment might better be inferred from the combined pattern of scales 8 and 9.

Scale 12 - Friendliness: Again, this is a scale with a high mean and little variance. The rationale for its inclusion was also the least defensible in terms of the idea of "pattern analysis" or interpreting the scales in relation to each other. The Manual section on scale

interpretation explicitly states that it is not intended as one of the scales indicative of motivational or maturity patterns. The only justification given for its inclusion is as follows: "Since successful social adjustment may be a critical factor for students on certain campuses, and relatively unimportant on others, the value of this description for different admissions officers will undoubtedly vary greatly." Not surprisingly, this was also the scale most frequently singled out as "unfair" by teachers on their questionnaires.

7. THE NATIONAL COLLEGE PRETEST

Date from the high school pretest were analyzed during the summer of 1963. The Record was then pretested during the fall in a sample of 82 colleges across the country. (See Appendix K for a complete list of participating institutions.) Objectives of this study were:

(1) to obtain information on college policies and practices pertinent to revision of the academic transcript;

(2) to obtain subjective reactions to the new form;

(3) to gather initial evidence of the "effect" of the scale information on admissions decisions.

Actually, the first two objectives listed above were the primary goals we had in mind for the pretest. In order to obtain admission officers' reactions to the form, however, it seemed necessary to have them do something more than just look at it. Thus, it was decided to have the admissions officers process mock transcripts in such a way that we might gain preliminary information about the effect (or utility) of scale information in admissions decisions.

Design of the Study

From data returned by schools that had participated in Design B of the high school pretest (those completing the long form of the Secondary School Record), two matched groups of 15 Records each were selected. These two groups were matched as evenly as possible with respect to rank in class, grade point average, and sex. In addition, College Entrance Examination Board score reports were simulated for each student so that the groups were matched on this variable as well. Statistics for the two groups were as follows:

	Students 1-15	Students 16-30
Number of males	8	7
Number of females	7	8
Average Rank in Class (converted to percentile scores)	78 %ile	80 %ile
Grade Point Average (2.5 = B)	2.66	2.57
Mean SAT-V	539.80	539.73
Mean SAT-M	540.87	542.27

The object of this equating was to try to make the two groups of students about "average" in terms of their academic qualifications as college applicants. What actually constitutes the "average" applicant, of course, will vary greatly from one college to the next. As can be seen from the statistics, we finally set an arbitrary standard for "average" as a solid "B" student in the upper quarter (though not the top 15%) of his class with College Board scores in the five hundreds. In reality, it turned out that we hit slightly above the average applicant group for most of the colleges in our sample.

Two sets of mock credentials were reproduced for each of the thirty students. Set A included the academic transcript and the school report (pages 1, 3 & 4 of the Secondary School Record). No scale information was included in this set. Set B, however, included the entire Record--the academic transcript, student description summary (scale information) and the school report. The simulated College Board score reports were attached to the academic transcript in both sets. In all cases, the Records were identified only by code number and not by student name.

Colleges were sent the mock credentials in two mailings of fifteen each. The admissions officer was asked to indicate as definite a decision

as he could make for each hypothetical applicant on a five point scale of (1) Definitely Accept, (2) Probably Accept, (3) Uncertain, (4) Probably Reject, and (5) Definitely Reject. All colleges received Set A information first and only after they had processed and returned it did they receive the Set B Records for processing. After Set B was completed, the admissions officer then filled out a questionnaire about his college's policies and practices and about his reaction to the new form. The eighty-two colleges in the sample were assigned at random to either a Sequence I or Sequence II order for receiving the mock Records. The design was as follows:

	Set "A" Records (no descriptive scales)	Set "B" Records (descriptive scales included)
Sequence I		
College 1		
" 2		
"	Students 1-15	Students 16-30
"		
" 41		
Sequence II		
College 42		
" 43		
"	Students 16-30	Students 1-15
"		
" 82		

Description of the Sample

With one exception, all colleges included in the sample were co-educational institutions. (Our one mens' college went along with good humor in processing the information for female applicants, but their data were not included in an analysis of the admisssions decisions.) The tables in Appendix L give a

statistical description of the sample in terms of (1) Region and College Board Membership; (2) Selectivity and College Board Membership; (3) Number of Applications Processed; and (4) Number of Applications Processed by Selectivity of the College.

As can be seen from this Appendix, the regional representation of the sample is adequate. The sample also seems fairly representative of different levels of selectivity, though the highly selective colleges are probably somewhat under-represented. (Only three colleges indicated that they admitted less than 25% of their applicants.) Contrary to what might be expected, there appears to be no relationship between a college's selectivity and the number of applications it processes.

One item on the admissions officer's questionnaire dealt with the appropriateness of the thirty academic transcripts which were included for each of the hypothetical applicants. Analysis of this question indicated that we had not succeeded in simulating an "average" group of applicants for most of our colleges. When asked, "Were the transcripts typical of a 'middle' group of applicants at your institution?" 54 of the 82 colleges replied "No." When questioned further as to how the transcripts were not typical, 41 of the 54 institutions (or 50% of the total sample) said that they were above their "middle" group.

Analysis of the "Effect" (Utility) of Scale Information

Because our equated applicant groups were considered "above average" academically by fifty percent of the colleges, analysis of the effect of scale information was considered relatively meaningless. Certainly, colleges tend to accept or reject applicants first and foremost on the

basis of academic qualifications. The need for personal characteristics information is felt most keenly for the vast "middle group" of applicants at any college who all tend to look alike scholastically.

Nonetheless, the study was designed to facilitate analysis of differences that occurred in decisions about a student, depending upon the presence or absence of descriptive scale information; and previous plans for the data were carried out. Each student, it will be remembered, was viewed by one half of the colleges as an "A" Set Record (without scale information) and by the other half as a "B" Set Record (with scale information). An admissions decision was indicated for each student on a five point scale running from "Definitely Accept" to "Definitely Reject." Two analyses were made.

The first analysis required the calculation of a Certainty Score. A value of 3 was given to every "definite" decision indicated by the admissions officer (accept or reject); a 2 was assigned to every "probable" decision (accept or reject); and the middle scale category of "uncertain" received a score of 1. A mean Certainty Score was calculated for each college for the fifteen Set A Records and for the fifteen Set B Records. A significance test between mean scores (over all colleges) showed no significant difference in certainty of admission decisions between Set A and Set B Records.

Because the certainty of an admissions decision could remain the same while the direction of the decision might shift with the addition of new information (from "Probably Reject" to "Probably Accept", for example), the second analysis focused on individual changes for each of the thirty students. For this analysis, an Absolute Score was given to each decision indicated by the admissions officer--from a score of 5 for "Definitely Accept" to a score

of 1 for "Definitely Reject." The mean Absolute Score (or "acceptability" score) was calculated for every student over all colleges that had viewed him as a Set A Record and over all colleges that had viewed him as a Set B Record. Tests were then run to determine significant changes that occurred in a student's "acceptability," depending upon whether or not his Record included the descriptive scale information. Significant shifts in acceptability between Set A and Set B Records were found for four of the thirty students. While these results are above chance level (five out of one hundred students might be expected to show a significant shift by chance), they cannot be definitively interpreted.

Again, it should be stressed that both analyses must be viewed with reservations, since the applicant Records did not represent the vast majority of "middle group" candidates for most of the colleges in our sample. The analyses are described here mainly for their suggestive value. Any adequate test of utility, however, will require prior knowledge of the typical "middle group" of applicants at any given college. Only when candidates are truly "average" in terms of academic qualifications can the usefulness of the scale information in facilitating admission decisions be assessed properly.

College Policies and Practices

Analysis of the policy items on the college questionnnaire proved most interesting, if somewhat contradictory in places. The following are results of that analysis (N=82).

1. Test Record: What test scores, if any, do you consider in your admissions decisions

	N
all test scores reported	42
only mental ability, scholastic aptitude, and achievement test scores	12
only mental ability, etc. administered from 10th grade on	6
only scores from nationally administered tests (ACT, CEEB, National Merit, etc.)	18
usually do not consider test scores	4

2. Semester Grades: Of the transcripts you received last year, approximately what percent reported two semester grades per year?

less than 25 percent	11
25 to 50 percent	17
50 to 75 percent	15
over 75 percent	38

In cases where grades for two semesters were reported, did you give equal weight to both grades or did you consider only the 2nd semester grade?

	N
equal weight to both grades	64
only 2nd semester grade	18

3. Policy on Recommendations: Does your school (or state require a Principal's or Counselor's written recommendation for applicants?

	N
yes	37
no	44
omit	1

Does your school (or state) require the Principal or Counselor to check a statement of recommendation for applicants - statements such as "recommended with enthusiasm," "may encounter some difficulty," etc.

	N
yes	39
no	42
omit	1

4. Report of Honors, Activities, Etc.: On the application form for your school, is there a section for the candidate to indicate his high school activities and honors?

	N
yes	64
no	18

If "yes" (to the above question), do you feel that provision of this same information on the high school transcript is necessary?

	N
yes	31
no	33
omit	18

Information obtained from these four questions proved very helpful in determining the final revision of the form. The question regarding college policies on recommendation, for example, clearly indicated that the final form of the Secondary School Record should include some provision for the counselor to make a routine statement of recommendation.

The most interesting thing about these results, however, is that they did not tend to support opinions expressed by many admissions officers at the May conference and at the earlier meeting of the School and College Relations Committee in January. (It should be noted that a similar lack of support was also evident in results from the high school counselor questionnaire, discussed in chapter 6.) Thus, prevailing views of several leading admissions officers seemed to be that: (1) test scores other than from aptitude or achievement tests are of little value for admissions purposes; (2) most high schools now tend to give only a final mark in a year's course and not semester grades; and (3) it is not necessary to have information about a student's activities and honors reported on the Secondary School Record. The questionnaire responses from our sample of eighty-two colleges do not bear out these views.

What the results do seem to underscore is the fact of diversity in American education and the gulf that exists between actual practice and the recommended policies of those active in professional leadership. Any Secondary School Record proposed for national use must strive to bridge that gulf, attempting to satisfy the requirements both of "what is" and "what should be"--as these requirements are mirrored both in field surveys and committee recommendations.

Reactions to the Descriptive Scales

As can be seen from the following breakdown, reaction to the new descriptive scales was generally quite favorable.

College Questionnaire Analysis

1. In general, did you find that the descriptive scales provided meaningful information about the candidates?

	%
very meaningful	57
somewhat meaningful	35
not very meaningful	4
can't say	4

2. In general, do you feel that the new scales gave you a more meaningful picture of the candidate than other "personality scale ratings" you are accustomed to receiving for applicants?

	%
more meaningful	80
same as others	10
less meaningful	4
can't say	5
omit	1

3. In general, was the Manual comprehensive and readable?

	%
yes	94
no	2
omit	4

4. Do you think that the descriptive scale information would be useful to have for post-admissions purposes--e.g., placement, counseling, etc.?

	%
very useful	46
somewhat useful	35
not very useful	16
omit	2

5. Assuming that it is feasible to have only <u>one</u> breakdown in the summary of descriptive ratings, which would you prefer?

	%
as form is now (by honors and advanced placement courses)	54
by years	15
by subject matter	13
no breakdown	13
omit	5

When these questionnaire data were analyzed by geographical region and by selectivity of the colleges, there was very little divergence from the response pattern of the total group. The only really noticeable difference occurred on question #4, where the most selective colleges were least enthusiastic about the usefulness of the scale information for post-admissions purposes.

As was true of the high school teachers and counselors, many admissions officers wrote their reactions and comments about the form on the back of the questionnaire. These comments are compiled in Appendix M. In reviewing these comments, the reader should keep in mind that the admissions officers were reacting to the full four-page version of the Record.

8. COMPLETION OF THE FINAL REVISION

After analysis of the college pretest data, recommendations for a final revision were prepared for discussion with the Joint Committee on School and College Relations at their meeting, December 8-10, 1963. Among the more general recommendations agreed upon by the committee were: (1) return to a horizontal format; and (2) reduction of the Record to a two-page form.

For the academic transcript side of the Record, recommendations focused on: (1) providing greater flexibility for the school to identify special courses and curriculum; (2) indicating significant information about the school and its program directly on the transcript, rather than having it "buried" in a school profile; and (3) expressing this information in standard terminology. Thus, it was agreed that space should be provided for both the identification and description of special courses or course sections -- honors, advanced placement, accelerated, independent study, etc. Because it was evident from pretest data that titles such as "honors" have different meanings from school to school, a standard terminology was worked out for the counselor to use in describing the general nature of any special course. It was also recommended that more space be provided for the explanation of how grades are weighted in determining rank in class. The problem of whether or not to ask for a listing of a student's activities and honors was resolved by having the school list only "outstanding" activities, honors and awards. A special sub-committee, consisting of one principal and one admissions officer, was appointed to work closely with ETS staff in resolving other minor details and questions pertaining to final revision of the academic transcript.

All proposed revisions of the descriptive scales were accepted by the Joint Committee. These included the elimination of four scales and revision of the remaining eight in order to clarify their precise meaning and reduce any high intercorrelations. While the committee fully concurred with the desirability of having a breakdown of teacher ratings in the Student Description Summary (particularly a breakdown by subject matter), they decided that the form should be kept as simple as possible for its initial introduction in schools and colleges. To help with interpretation of the descriptive scale summary, it was suggested that an adequate "Comment" space be provided, with specific instructions to the counselor to report information helpful in interpreting the descriptive summary -- for example, specifying subjects in which the student is described by an unusual or significant pattern of behavior. It was recognized that this "Comment" space might also serve as a place for the counselor to write some overall recommendation if he wished to do so. Provision was also made at the bottom of the page for a very brief, perfunctory statement of recommendation (e.g., "student recommended for college work") or for the school to indicate that its policy precludes any official recommending of students.

After the Joint Committee had agreed upon the specifications for a final revision, draft forms of all proposed materials were constructed during January and sent to each member of the committee for approval and/or minor changes. The project officially terminated in March, 1964, when all materials were turned over to the NASSP for publication. The revised forms (see Appendix D), which were made available to schools and colleges in the fall of 1964, include the following:

Secondary School Record - a two page form consisting of the academic transcript and the student description summary.

Student Description Form - a two page form containing eight descriptive scales, used to gather descriptive data from teachers.

Manual for Schools and Colleges - a manual explaining the basic rationale of the revision and containing specific instructions for completing the Record and interpreting the descriptive scale information.

9. THE COMMUNICATIONS STUDY

As stated at the outset of this report, the project was approached from a communications framework in which fidelity (or accurate communication) is considered the first and foremost requirement of the Secondary School Record. Chapter 4 described a communications study, carried out during the local pretesting of materials, that was designed to assess the fidelity of the first experimental revision compared with the old form.

An attempt was made to develop this type of communications study further during the period of national pretesting. For this purpose, ETS engaged the assistance of three counselors -- all active members of the American School Counselors Association -- who conducted taped interviews at schools participating in the national high school pretest. Specifically, each counselor was asked to obtain as much information as possible about two or three students for whom the long form of the Secondary School Record has been filled out. An interview guide (see Appendix N) was devised for use by the counselors, to try to insure some standard procedures during the interviewing sessions. A total of eight taped interviews, obtained in this manner, were sent to ETS.

Of these interviews, the four that seemed richest in content were selected for use in the college part of the study. The Secondary School Record for each of these students was duplicated and sent to four admissions officers: Mr. John Hoy at Swarthmore College, Mr. Humphrey Doermann at Harvard University, Miss Jane Sehman at Smith College, and Mr. Eugene S. Wilson at Amherst College. The admissions officers were asked to study the Records and be prepared to discuss each of the students.

The author visited each admissions officer and conducted taped interviews of approximately one hour. These interviews were conducted during the fall of 1963, while the college pretest study was going on, and their purpose was actually twofold--i.e., to obtain firsthand reactions to the form and suggestions for its improvement, as well as to observe how it was used (interpreted) in actual practice. Because of this dual purpose, the interviewer made no attempt to stick rigidly to a schedule of equal "interpretation time" for each student. If an admissions officer got off on a point about the form per se, he was encouraged to do so and to explain his suggestions in full. The information and insights thus obtained proved most helpful in preparing recommendations for the final revision, but the resulting interview data were not as exhaustive about each student as they might otherwise have been.

Analysis of the interview data proved something of a problem. During the period that college visits were being made, a standard procedure (which had been worked out previously by the author) was first applied to the high school interviews. This procedure provided for a simple checking of the degree (high, moderate, low), consistency, and desirability (desirable, neutral, undesirable) of several predetermined variables within such general categories as Motivation, Maturity, Social Relations, Work Habits, Intellectual Attitudes, etc. This method of analysis proved generally unfeasible and unsatisfactory, however. For one thing, the style of the counselor interviewers differed considerably, so that information was not covered in the same manner and any single set of predetermined variables could not be systematically applied. But even if this had been possible, it was evident that such a

systematic reduction of the data robbed it of much of its life and vitality. The resulting student descriptions seemed quite artificial.

In the long run, a much simpler method of analysis was devised and applied to one of the four student cases. Working independently, two research assistants culled the interview data, listing all statements of information or interpretation about the student on 3x5 cards. The cards obtained from the high school interviews were then pulled together in a summary interpretation of the student. This summary interpretation was compared with the individual statements made by an admissions officer about the student. The following is an example of this type of procedure.

SUMMARY INTERPRETATION OF STUDENT #2
(from statements made by 5 teachers and a counselor)

The original motivation for #2 seems to have stemmed from her home atmosphere which produces a constant flow of stimulating people and ideas. Her parents consider academic excellence as highly desirable. #2 has succeeded by obtaining all A's (except one). The importance of good grades is further underscored by the necessity of financial aid for college. Father is an ex-minister turned English college professor--warm, intellectual home life. Needs and enjoys the challenge of stimulating classroom work.

#2 is considered extremely mature although a little less socially than intellectually. She does not mind being the dissentor either in ideas or dress but does not challenge merely for effect. Her views are liberal and well-thought out--she is calling into question all her own and "inherited" parental values and standards.

She takes advantage of _____ college's lectures and art exhibits and shows an eagerness to discuss things she considers important--her social awareness and concern are reflected in her activities such as CORE.

#2 has a tendency to be disorganized and to wait until the last minute to do her work--this makes her work inconsistent, sometimes superb and sometimes flat. She avoids and dislikes "busy work" and is excited only when class discussions turn to the abstract--she considers herself lazy but her teachers contradict this. She pursues her own interests in art and literature.

#2 views and measures things (including herself) in terms of the ideal--yet she also has a keen analytical mind that produces outstanding work in math. She has good insight and favors the broad view. Although she might not back up generalizations in essays, teachers would always find out she knew what she was talking about.

#2 does not feel generally accepted by her peers, for their interests do not coincide--she has a small circle of friends, however, several of which are seniors--she feels uneasy with boys of her own age--she is greatly respected by her peers, however, and surprises them with her athletic ability. She is reserved and sensitive but is at the same time warm and friendly. She has a great deal of empathy but becomes impatient with others who are not as sensitive as she--with adults, #2 borders on the formal while being friendly. She is somewhat of a loner.

#2 will take leadership only when pushed into it but then handles it competently. When she knows what she wants or disagrees, she will be tenacious and persistent. She organized a literary discussion group outside of school but generally does not participate in class unless the discussion particularly excites her. Enjoys a challenge and the unexpected.

STATEMENTS MADE BY ADMISSIONS OFFICER ABOUT STUDENT #2

1. "Well, #2 makes full use of her talent and ability, which are manifested by her test scores and her record and rank in class."

2. "In looking at the teachers' report, her motivation seems to me to be good, her maturity is very good."

3. "She's a questioning sort of person but does it respectively and is not the type of student who questions for piciune reasons or to cover insecurity."

4. "I would say she is a mature young lady who is confident of her ability."

5. "She's not the intrinsic type seeking truth, she's looking for marks and achievements, I think,--which she's gotten."

6. (Interviewer: "But you feel basically her motivation was for grades--achievement?") "Well, no. That isn't quite fair because her activities show her doing things in civil rights and literary discussions, that are not for grades. She is interested in doing something about the society around her."

7. "Her activities show that she's aware of what's going on and a concerned individual."

8. "Her civil rights work, her literary discussions for students and teachers shows an imagination and initiative."

9. "She comes from an academic home where she's probably been encouraged in her intellectual work."

10. "I think she's a leader. I think they (her classmates) respect her and I think she takes stands on things and is respected for it. I don't think she's the oddball kind of different personality that students would not respect. I think her respect for others is reciprocated."

11. (Interviewer: "How about her teachers? Do the teachers like to have #2 in class or not?") "I think most of them do. She may embarrass one or two but when you think that she's carrying six courses and I think this accounts for the slightly lower rating in quantity of work and some of the others. No teachers feel that she's really (but one teacher does)--but really very very high. She's doing so darn much--six full courses with those activities--if she's average in the quantity of work and evenness of performance, she's done something."

12. "Six solids and those activities don't give her very much time to be always prompt and to have a great deal in quantity of work."

Despite the obvious problems involved in analyzing interview data, this type of communications study is recommended as the most appropriate test of the Secondary School Record's fidelity. It is considered most appropriate because it is least artificial in simulating what <u>actually happens</u> in the communications process--the high school's collective "picture" of a student is encoded in a school record and then decoded or interpreted by an admissions officer. The more precisely the two "pictures" coincide, the more accurately the Record has fulfilled its essential communications job.

10. SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The 1964 edition of the Secondary School Record represents more than a mere "face-lifting" operation. Culminating 18 months of developmental work, it is a set of materials designed to articulate a philosophy of communications and to implement a system of communications between high schools and colleges. Thus, this edition of the Record proposes an essentially new method of collecting and communicating information about a student. Although the effectiveness of the system in operation cannot be assessed until a sufficient number of Records have actually been used, plans should be formulated for further research and developmental work. It is suggested that such plans focus on two basic aspects of the problem--operational improvements in the system, and content improvements in the materials.

First, it seems obvious that the success of the system will depend in large part upon the teachers, counselors, and admissions officers who are involved in it. The teacher who fills out the descriptive scales without reference to their meaning as defined in the Manual will supply misleading information. The counselor who does not use standard terminology in describing special courses will supply inaccurate information. The admissions officer who blindly looks for "top" check marks on each individual scale will make false interpretations. If the system is to work, it must be clearly understood by all concerned. Thus, an essential first step will be to survey ongoing practices with the new materials to determine the general level of competency and ease with which they are being handled. Only then, can significant inadequacies be diagnosed and the necessary steps taken to remedy them.

Another important operational consideration is the eventual design of the forms for electronic data processing. Already, many high schools are involved in cooperative plans for machine processing of vital records, and it is certain that educational use of modern technology will increase tremendously in the next few years. While every school or region could design its own input and output documents (and presumably are doing so now), there would be obvious advantage in having standard forms.

With respect to content of the materials, it will be of fundamental importance to make further study of the descriptive scales. What patterns of behavior ("types" of students) actually do emerge from the scales? What are the correlates of these patterns--how do they relate to such things as grades, interests, creative talents, and cognitive styles of the student? Once such information is obtained, its value will be realized as it "feeds back" into the system. If the scales do not differentiate any distinguishable behavior patterns, they should be revised. If they do, and if correlates of these patterns are found, this information should be incorporated in the Interpretation section of the Manual. A word of caution should be said about the design of these studies, however. To prevent the "wash-out" of all detectable effects, it will probably be most fruitful (at least in initial studies) to analyze data by individual schools or groups of similar schools. Thus, relatively small-scale studies in samples of different types of institutions are recommended over against any large study utilizing a "national sample" of schools and colleges.

As steps are taken to insure appropriate use of materials and as we gain more definitive information about the scales, then it will be possible to conduct more definitive studies of the overall effectiveness of the system in terms of its fidelity and utility. It has already been stated

that fidelity is the primary criterion of effectiveness, and the last chapter described the type of study recommended for assessing fidelity. In addition, further study should be made of the Record's utility. At present, we have been content to define utility in terms of facilitating admissions decisions. A general procedure for assessing this type of utility was outlined in chapter 7, along with criticisms of the procedure and suggestions for its improvement. Ultimately, however, utility should be defined in terms of facilitating correct admissions decisions, as judged by college faculty. When criterion instruments of "desirability" such as those being developed by Davis (4) are fully operational, it should be possible to study the relationship between the descriptive scale information and college faculty perceptions of the student.

Finally, it perhaps goes without saying that the content of the academic part of the Record should be periodically re-evaluated. Conditions change, and any effective system of communication between schools and colleges must necessarily reflect new demands and changes as they take place.

REFERENCES

1. Critchfield, J. B., & Hutson, P. W. "Validity of the Personality Record," College and University, 1964, 40, 41-48.

2. Cronbach, L. J., & Gleser, G. C. Psychological Tests and Personnel Decisions, University of Illinois Press, 1957.

3. Davis, J. A. "Nonintellectual Factors in College Student Achievement, From High School to College, New York, College Entrance Examination Board, 1965.

4. Davis, J. A. "The Criterion Problem in College Admissions Research." Research in Higher Education, New York, College Entrance Examination Board, 1965.

5. Dickerson, A. I. How Colleges Use Reports on Character." College Admissions #4, New York, College Entrance Examination Board, 1957.

6. Fishman, J. A. "Some Social-Psychological Theory for Selecting and Guiding College Students," in N. Sanford (ed.), The American College, John Wiley & Sons, 1962.

7. Osgood, C. E. "Fidelity and Reliability," in H. Quastler (ed.), Information Theory in Psychology, the Free Press, 1955.

APPENDIX A

THE 1958 EDITION OF THE SECONDARY SCHOOL RECORD

Secondary-School Record
(REVISED)

Name, in full ..... Birth Date ..... Sex .....
Last Name First Name Middle Name M. or F.

Home Address .....
Number and Street City State

Name of Parent or Guardian ..... School accredited by

Entered ..... Was graduated / Will be graduated / Withdrew ....
Name of School Month Year

....
Month Year Location of School

Class periods are ..... minutes, ... times a week, ... weeks a year. Passing mark is ..... College recommending mark .....

1. List your complete marking system, highest to lowest: ..... Honor marks .....

2. List other secondary schools by years attended: .....

Are all failing marks for each year listed? ☐ yes ☐ no

CLASS RECORD

Check (√) all subjects where no marks are given.
Star (*) all subjects in progress.

Subject	Grade → / Year → 19	1st Sem 9		1st Sem 10		1st Sem 11		1st Sem 12		Extra		Standard Exams	Units or Cred.
English													
Lang.													
Math.													
Check Special Lab Periods	Yes	No											
Science													
Social Studies													
Other Subjects													

Notes

A **unit** represents the study of a subject a full school year four or five times per week.
One **unit** equals two credits unless otherwise defined.
Use **extra** column for extra school year.
Use **exams** column for special exams as Regents, *etc.*

TEST RECORD

	Name and Form of Test	Year Given	Score	%-ile Gr. Level	Basis*
Mental Ability					
Reading					
Achievement					
Others					

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

*Give available interpretation of tests on an enclosure.

Total number of units school requires for graduation .....

Applicant ranks ☐ exactly ☐ approximately ..... in graduating class of ..... students.

School computed above rank in class by using official record beginning with ..... grade and ending with ..... semester in ..... grade:

☐ Marks weighted as recommended by NASSP and AACRAO
☐ Includes all subjects given school credit
☐ Major or full-time subjects only
☐ College preparatory students only

Date ..... Signature ..... Title .....

This Standardized Form prepared and recommended for national use by the Joint Committee on School-College Relations of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals (NASSP) and American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO).

Copyright, 1958 by the National Association of Secondary-School Principals of the NEA, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. All rights reserved. This blank, or any parts thereof, may not be reproduced except by permission.

67

Personality Record (Confidential)
(REVISED)

Room .....
Grade .....

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF .....
Last Name First Name Middle Name

School ..... Town or City ..... State .....

The following characterizations are descriptions of behavior. It is recommended that where possible the judgments of a number of the pupil's present teachers be indicated by the use of the following method or by checks:

Example: MOTIVATION

Purposeless	Vacillating	Usually Purposeful	Effectively motivated	Highly motivated
	1 ✓	M (5) ✓✓✓✓✓		2 ✓✓

M (5) indicates the most common or modal behavior of the pupil as shown by the agreement of five of the eight teachers reporting. The location of the numerals to the left and right indicates that one teacher considers the pupil *vacillating* and that two teachers consider him *highly motivated*. If preferred, the subject fields or other areas of relationship with the pupil may be used to replace the numerals.

1. MOTIVATION	Purposeless	Vacillating	Usually Purposeful	Effectively motivated	Highly motivated
2. INDUSTRY	Seldom works even under pressure	Needs constant pressure	Needs occasional prodding	Prepares assigned work regularly	Seeks additional work
3. INITIATIVE	Merely conforms	Seldom initiates	Frequently initiates	Consistently self-reliant	Actively creative
4. INFLUENCE AND LEADERSHIP	Negative	Co-operative but retiring	Sometimes in minor affairs	Contributing in important affairs	Judgment respected—makes things go
5. CONCERN FOR OTHERS	Indifferent	Self-centered	Somewhat socially concerned	Generally concerned	Deeply and actively concerned
6. RESPONSIBILITY	Unreliable	Somewhat dependable	Usually dependable	Conscientious	Assumes much responsibility
7. INTEGRITY	Not dependable	Questionable at times	Generally honest	Reliable, dependable	Consistently trustworthy
8. EMOTIONAL STABILITY	Hyperemotional / Apathetic	Excitable / Unresponsive	Usually well-balanced	Well-balanced	Exceptionally stable

Significant school activities and special interests or abilities. List membership and offices held in school activities.

Significant limitations (physical, social, mental):

Additional information which may be helpful, such as probable financial needs or work experience:

Principal's Comments and Recommendations

1. Specific statement concerning the applicant's fitness for acceptance by this college or employer:

2. Principal's estimate of applicant's future success, based on the purpose of this application.

☐ Little success ☐ May encounter some difficulty ☐ Average ☐ Above average ☐ Superior

3. Specific recommendation ☐ Recommended ☐ Not recommended for this college or position ☐ Prefer not to make recommendation

Date ..... Signature ..... Title .....

This Standardized Form prepared and recommended for national use by the Joint Committee on School-College Relations of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals (NASSP) and American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO).

Copyright, 1958 by the National Association of Secondary-School Principals of the NEA, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. All rights reserved. This blank, or any parts thereof, may not be reproduced except by permission.

APPENDIX B

THE FIRST EXPERIMENTAL REVISION

1. Teachers Evaluation Form
2. Personal Characteristics Report

RF-2

TEACHERS EVALUATION FORM

Evaluation of: _____
(Student's Last Name) (First Name) (Initial)

By: _____ Subject Taught: _____
(Teacher's Name)

The purpose of this form is to obtain your evaluation of this student's behavior in the classroom and in your personal contacts with him.

Please enter your name and the subject(s) you have taught this student on the line above. Answer all questions by placing a check on the line opposite the statement that best describes your evaluation of the student's behavior.

Mark one, and only one, statement for each question; do not place a check between statements. Where there is doubt that all teachers may have had adequate opportunity to observe a particular kind of behavior, a "Little or No Opportunity to Observe" space is provided. Please complete the entire form and do not omit any questions.

DO NOT PROCEED UNTIL YOU HAVE READ THE MANUAL FOR THE TEACHERS EVALUATION FORM. Since the MANUAL explains and illustrates the meaning of the evaluations you are asked to make, it is extremely important that you are familiar with the MANUAL and have it readily available for reference when filling out this form.

1) Frequency of Participation in Class Discussion This student actively participates in class discussions:

___ Almost always
___ Frequently
___ Occasionally
___ Seldom
___ Never

___ Little opportunity to observe

2) Achievement Effort In general, how much effort has this student expended in attaining his present level of achievement in your class?

___ A great deal of effort
___ Considerable effort
___ Some effort
___ Little effort
___ Almost no effort

3) Attentiveness and Interest In class, this student usually appears to be:

___ Actively interested
___ Moderately interested
___ "Politely" attentive
___ Bored and disinterested
___ Distracted and not listening

___ No alternative appropriate; student vacillates greatly

4) Evenness of Performance With respect of quality of work produced, how would you characterize this student's performance?

___ Markedly even; quality of work quite stable
___ Slightly uneven; quality of work varies some
___ Markedly uneven; quality of work varies greatly

5) Depth of Understanding In ability to analyze ideas, and in understanding of abstract concepts, this student is:

___ Excellent
___ Good
___ Fair
___ Poor
___ Very poor

6) Attitude Toward Adults - Respect How would you characterize this student's usual attitude toward you?

___ Genuinely respectful
___ "Appropriately" respectful
___ Neither respectful nor disrespectful
___ Slightly disrespectful
___ Definitely disrespectful

___ Little opportunity to observe

7) Promptness How prompt is this student in turning papers in on time and meeting other course deadline dates?

___ Always prompt
___ Usually prompt
___ Somewhat lax
___ Frequently late
___ Almost always late

8) Attitude Toward Adults - Warmth In personal contacts with you, this student is usually:

___ Genuinely warm
___ Friendly
___ Rather neutral
___ Somewhat unfriendly
___ Definitely hostile

___ Little opportunity to observe

9) Involvement When Participating in Class Discussions With what degree of interest and involvement does this student participate in class discussions? His involvement is usually:

___ Very high
___ Moderate to considerable
___ Mild
___ Little
___ Completely lacking

___ No alternative appropriate; student vacillates greatly

___ No opportunity to observe

10) Independence of Judgment In forming opinions, conclusions, and interpretations, this student seems:

___ Markedly independent
___ Somewhat independent
___ Dependent on others

___ Little opportunity to observe

11) Scope of Intellectual Awareness and Concern With respect to ideas, issues, and events outside of school, this student has shown:

___ Considerable knowledge and interest
___ Moderate knowledge and interest
___ Some knowledge, but little interest; or some interest, but little knowledge
___ Little knowledge or interest
___ No knowledge or interest

___ Little opportunity to observe

12) Acceptance of Authority - Policies How has this student accepted your authority as a teacher in making and/or enforcing classroom policies?

___ Has always accepted unquestioningly
___ Has never questioned, but sometimes has had obvious reservations
___ Has occasionally questioned policies
___ Has sometimes openly challenged policies
___ Has often openly challenged policies

13) Sense of Personal Responsibility for Own Actions To what extent does this student accept personal responsibility for the consequences of his own "inadequate" behavior?

___ Consistently accepts full responsibility
___ Usually accepts full responsibility
___ Usually accepts partial responsibility
___ Often refuses to accept responsibility
___ Consistently refuses to accept responsibility

___ No opportunity to observe

14) "Going Beyond" Assignments How often has this student done work for your course that was not assigned and/or required?

___ Quite frequently
___ Several times
___ Occasionally
___ Seldom
___ Never

___ Question not appropriate to the nature of this class

15) Acceptance of Authority - Subject Interpretation How has this student accepted your authority as a teacher with respect to your interpretations of subject matter?

___ Has always accepted unquestioningly
___ Has never questioned, but sometimes has had obvious reservations
___ Has occasionally questioned interpretations
___ Has sometimes openly challenged interpretations
___ Has often openly challenged interpretations

16) Writing Ability How would you rate the following three aspects of this student's writing ability?

	Basic Skills	Organizational Ability	Style
Excellent	___	___	___
Good	___	___	___
Mediocre	___	___	___
Poor	___	___	___
Very Poor	___	___	___

___ No opportunity to observe writing skills

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS REPORT RF-2

Student's Name _____
last name first name middle name

School _____ / _____ / _____
name of school town or city state

PART I: COUNSELOR'S OR PRINCIPAL'S REPORT

1) School Activities. List activities in which student has participated. Indicate length of time in activity and position or office held, if any. For example: Service Club (10); Newspaper (10-12), editor 12. Please underline activities in which student has made an outstanding or significant contribution.

2) Honors, Special Interests, Significant Contributions. List all honors and awards student has received. Describe any special interest this student has pursued outside of school, and/or any special contribution he has made to the life of the school.

3) Educational and Vocational Interests. In what specific subject(s) or area(s) has the student shown greatest interest? Has student formed any vocational plans--broad or specific? What?

4) Factors Inhibiting Achievement. Please comment on any factors which may have interfered with this student achieving to the top of his ability (e.g., unusual home situation, physical or mental health, lack of confidence or interest, involvement in activities, family pressures, excessive social life, part-time employment, etc.).

5) Area(s) of Greatest Strength. Considering all of this student's accomplishments (academic, personal, social), what would you say are his most outstanding characteristics? (E.g., intellectual ability, motivation, perseverance, influence and leadership, cooperativeness, sensitivity to others, ability to adjust to unusual circumstances, etc.)

6) Personal Integrity. How do you rate the integrity of this student? Please comment (use additional sheet if necessary).

7) Concern for Others. To what extent has this student shown a genuine concern for the welfare and rights of others?

8) Self-Insight and Direction. Has this student displayed some self-insight and understanding in discussing his future plans? Has student assumed a share of responsibility in making educational and vocational decisions, or has he relied entirely on parental or counselor direction in these matters? Please comment.

9) Specific Recommendation. Please give your appraisal of this student's likelihood of success (both in terms of academic performance and other contributions) at this particular institution. Include any factors which you feel might make this school uniquely appropriate for the candidate.

Signed _____ Position _____

Length of Acquaintance with Student _____

PART II: SUMMARY OF TEACHERS' EVALUATIONS

Summarized below are the evaluations of ____ teachers in the following subject areas (underline appropriate areas):

Agriculture; Art; Business and Commerce; English; Foreign Language; History and Social Studies; Home Economics; Industrial Arts; Mathematics; Music; Physical and Biological Science; Social Science; Other (specify):

Class Discussion (1) Frequency of Partic	Class Discussion (9) Involvement in Partic	Attentiveness (3) and Interest
always _ _ _ _ _ _ _	very high _ _ _ _ _ _ _	active _ _ _ _ _ _ _
freq _ _ _ _ _ _ _	mod-con _ _ _ _ _ _ _	moderate _ _ _ _ _ _ _
occas _ _ _ _ _ _ _	mild _ _ _ _ _ _ _	polite _ _ _ _ _ _ _
seldom _ _ _ _ _ _ _	little _ _ _ _ _ _ _	bored _ _ _ _ _ _ _
never	lacking	distracted
	vacillates _ _ _ _ _ _	vacillates _ _ _ _ _ _

Achievement Effort (2)	Going Beyond Assign (14)	Evenness of Work (4)
a great deal _ _ _ _ _ _ _	frequently _ _ _ _ _ _ _	very even _ _ _ _ _
considerable _ _ _ _ _ _ _	many times _ _ _ _ _ _ _	rather uneven _ _ _ _ _
some _ _ _ _ _ _ _	occas _ _ _ _ _ _ _	very uneven _ _ _ _ _
little _ _ _ _ _ _ _	seldom _ _ _ _ _ _ _	
almost none	never	
	ques inapprop _ _ _ _ _	

Depth Understanding (5)	Intel Awareness (11)	Independent Judgment (10)
excellent _ _ _ _ _ _ _	considerable _ _ _ _ _	markedly indep _ _ _ _ _
good _ _ _ _ _ _ _	moderate _ _ _ _ _	somewhat indep _ _ _ _ _
fair _ _ _ _ _ _ _	some _ _ _ _ _	dependent _ _ _ _ _
poor _ _ _ _ _ _ _	little _ _ _ _ _	
very poor	none	no opportunity _ _ _ _ _

Promptness in Meeting Deadlines (7)	Authority Acceptance Class Policies (12)	Authority Acceptance Subj Interpretations (15)
always prompt _ _ _ _	unques _ _ _ _ _	unques _ _ _ _ _
usually prompt _ _ _ _	some reserv _ _ _ _ _	some reserv _ _ _ _ _
somewhat lax _ _ _ _	occas ques _ _ _ _ _	occas ques _ _ _ _ _
freq late _ _ _ _	some chal _ _ _ _ _	some chal _ _ _ _ _
always late	often chal	often chal

Attitude-Respect (6)	Attitude-Warmth (8)	Responsibility (13)
genuine _ _ _ _ _ _	gen warm _ _ _ _ _	always accepts _ _ _ _
approp _ _ _ _ _ _	friendly _ _ _ _ _	usually acc _ _ _ _
neither _ _ _ _ _ _	neutral _ _ _ _ _	partially acc _ _ _ _
some dis _ _ _ _ _ _	unfriendly _ _ _ _	often refuses _ _ _ _
def dis	hostile	always refuses
no opportunity _ _ _	no opportunity _ _ _	no opportunity _ _ _ _

Basic Writing Skills (16a)	Organizational Ability (16b)	Writing Style (16c)
excellent _ _ _ _ _ _	excellent _ _ _ _ _ _ _	excellent _ _ _ _ _ _ _
good _ _ _ _ _ _	good _ _ _ _ _ _ _	good _ _ _ _ _ _ _
mediocre _ _ _ _ _ _	mediocre _ _ _ _ _ _	mediocre _ _ _ _ _ _
poor _ _ _ _ _ _	poor _ _ _ _ _ _	poor _ _ _ _ _ _
very poor	very poor	very poor

APPENDIX C

THE SECOND EXPERIMENTAL REVISION

1. Student Description Form
2. Secondary School Record

STUDENT DESCRIPTION FORM

Student's Name:..... (Last) (First) (Middle Initial)

Grade Level: 9th..... 10th..... 11th..... 12th.....

Teacher's Name:..... Subject(s) taught:.....

Honors course ☐ Advanced placement course ☐

The purpose of this form is to obtain your description of this student's behavior in the classroom.

Please enter the student's name, his current grade level, your name, and the subject(s) you have taught this student on the lines above. Check to indicate if you taught student in an honors course or advanced placement course.

Answer all questions by placing a check on the line opposite the statement that *best describes* the student's behavior.

Mark one, and only one, descriptive rating category for each question; do not place a check between rating categories.

Please complete the entire form and do not omit any questions.

DO NOT PROCEED UNTIL YOU HAVE READ THE MANUAL FOR THE STUDENT DESCRIPTION FORM

Since the MANUAL explains and illustrates the meaning of the ratings you are asked to make, it is *essential* that you be thoroughly familiar with the MANUAL before filling out this form.

STUDENT DESCRIPTION FORM

Check if you have taught this student in an honors course ☐ advanced placement course ☐

(1) Participation in Discussions

..... almost always
..... frequently
..... occasionally
..... seldom
..... never

..... no opportunity

(2) Classroom Interest

..... very high
..... active
..... mild
..... bored
..... distracted

..... vacillates greatly

(3) Independent Work—Interest

..... very high
..... active
..... mild
..... little
..... disinterested

..... no opportunity

(4) Evenness of Performance

..... highly consistent
..... usually consistent
..... slightly uneven
..... usually uneven
..... very erratic

(5) Quantity of Work

..... a great deal
..... above average
..... average
..... below average
..... often inadequate

..... vacillates greatly

(6) Promptness

..... always prompt
..... usually prompt
..... somewhat lax
..... frequently late
..... always late

(7) Independence of Judgment

..... markedly independent
..... usually independent
..... emerging independence
..... somewhat dependent
..... definitely dependent

..... no opportunity

(8) Questioning Attitude

..... often challenges
..... sometimes challenges
..... occasionally skeptical
..... some probing
..... rarely questions

..... no opportunity

(9) Depth of Understanding

..... very insightful
..... good understanding
..... some insight
..... little insight
..... poor understanding

..... no opportunity

(10) Personal Responsibility

..... always accepts fully
..... usually accepts fully
..... partially accepts
..... sometimes refuses
..... often refuses

(11) Respect for Others

..... genuine
..... usually genuine
..... courteous
..... some disrespect
..... often disrespectful

(12) Friendliness

..... warm
..... friendly
..... neutral
..... not very friendly
..... hostile

Additional Comments

SECONDARY SCHOOL RECORD
(PRELIMINARY REVISION)

STUDENT INFORMATION

LAST NAME | FIRST NAME | MIDDLE NAME

HOME ADDRESS | NUMBER AND STREET | CITY | STATE

PARENT OR GUARDIAN

DATE OF BIRTH | SEX M ☐ F ☐ | WAS GRADUATED / WILL BE GRADUATED / WITHDREW | MONTH | YEAR

LIST OTHER SECONDARY SCHOOLS BY YEARS ATTENDED

SCHOOL INFORMATION

SCHOOL | ENTERED MONTH YEAR

LOCATION | SCHOOL ACCREDITED BY

CLASS PERIODS ARE | MINUTES | TIMES A WEEK | WEEKS A YEAR

PASSING MARK | HONOR MARKS | UNITS REQUIRED FOR GRADUATION

LIST YOUR COMPLETE MARKING SYSTEM, HIGHEST TO LOWEST, WITH NUMERICAL EQUIVALENTS
(IF AVAILABLE, ATTACH AN EXPLANATION OF YOUR MARKING SYSTEM, AND A SCHOOL PROFILE)

Identify all honors, accelerated, summer courses, etc.
Are all failing marks listed? ☐ Yes ☐ No

CLASS RECORD

Check (√) all subjects where no marks are given
Star (*) all subjects in progress

	GRADE 9	1st SEM.	2nd SEM.	UNIT or CRED.	GRADE 10	1st SEM.	2nd SEM.	UNIT or CRED.	GRADE 11	1st SEM.	2nd SEM.	UNIT or CRED.	GRADE 12	1st SEM.	2nd SEM.	UNIT or CRED.
ENGLISH																
LANG.																
MATH.																
	Check Special Lab. Periods / Yes / No				Yes / No				Yes / No				Yes / No			
SCIENCE																
SOCIAL STUDIES																
OTHER SUBJECTS																

TEST RECORD

NAME AND FORM OF TEST	YEAR GIVEN	NORM GROUP	TYPE OF SCORE	SUBSECTION TITLE	SCORE	SUBSECTION TITLE	SCORE	SUBSECTION TITLE	SCORE	SUBSECTION TITLE	SCORE	SUBSECTION TITLE	SCORE

A unit represents the study of a subject a full school year four or five times per week.

Applicant ranks ☐ exactly _____ in a class ☐ approx.
of _____ students. Based on _____ semesters.

Check appropriate rank information:

- ☐ Marks weighted as recommended by NASSP and AACRAO
- ☐ Special weighting (please explain)
- ☐ All subjects given credit
- ☐ Major or full-time subjects only
- ☐ College preparatory students only
- ☐ All students

Signature _____

Title _____ Date _____

© Copyright 1963 by the National Association of Secondary-School Principals of the NEA, Washington, D. C. All rights reserved. This blank, or any parts thereof, may not be reproduced except by permission.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

LAST NAME FIRST NAME MIDDLE INITIAL

SECONDARY SCHOOL RECORD: Descriptive ratings of _____

Summarized below are the descriptive ratings of ☐ 10th ☐ 11th ☐ 12th grade teachers in the following subject areas:

Regular courses _____
(Indicate ratings of these teachers in Reg. column)

Honors or Advanced Placement courses _____
(Indicate ratings of these teachers in H-AP column)

(1) Participation in Discussions		(2) Classroom Interest		(3) Independent Work Interest	
H-AP	REG	H-AP	REG	H-AP	REG
___	___ almost always	___	___ very high	___	___ very high
___	___ frequently	___	___ active	___	___ active
___	___ occasionally	___	___ mild	___	___ mild
___	___ seldom	___	___ bored	___	___ little
___	___ never	___	___ distracted	___	___ disinterested
___	___ no opportunity	___	___ vacillates greatly	___	___ no opportunity

(4) Evenness of Performance		(5) Quantity of Work		(6) Promptness	
H-AP	REG	H-AP	REG	H-AP	REG
___	___ highly consistent	___	___ a great deal	___	___ always prompt
___	___ usually consistent	___	___ above average	___	___ usually prompt
___	___ slightly uneven	___	___ average	___	___ somewhat lax
___	___ usually uneven	___	___ below average	___	___ frequently late
___	___ very erratic	___	___ often inadequate	___	___ always late
		___	___ vacillates greatly		

(7) Independence of Judgment		(8) Questioning Attitude		(9) Depth of Understanding	
H-AP	REG	H-AP	REG	H-AP	REG
___	___ markedly independent	___	___ often challenges	___	___ very insightful
___	___ usually independent	___	___ sometimes challenges	___	___ good understanding
___	___ emerging independence	___	___ occasionally skeptical	___	___ some insight
___	___ somewhat dependent	___	___ some probing	___	___ little insight
___	___ definitely dependent	___	___ rarely questions	___	___ poor understanding
___	___ no opportunity	___	___ no opportunity	___	___ no opportunity

(10) Personal Responsibility		(11) Respect for Others		(12) Friendliness	
H-AP	REG	H-AP	REG	H-AP	REG
___	___ always accepts fully	___	___ genuine	___	___ warm
___	___ usually accepts fully	___	___ usually genuine	___	___ friendly
___	___ partially accepts	___	___ courteous	___	___ neutral
___	___ sometimes refuses	___	___ some disrespect	___	___ not very friendly
___	___ often refuses	___	___ often disrespectful	___	___ hostile

ADDITIONAL TEACHER COMMENTS:

© Copyright 1963 by the National Association of Secondary-School Principals of the NEA, Washington, D. C. All rights reserved.
This blank, or any parts thereof, may not be reproduced except by permission.

PRELIMINARY REVISION

LAST NAME FIRST NAME MIDDLE INITIAL

SECONDARY SCHOOL RECORD: School Report on _____

NOTE: Give most significant information in space provided on this page. If additional space is required, use reverse side of this sheet.

FACTORS RELATING TO ACHIEVEMENT—Please give any information you feel would assist in interpreting student's academic record.

28

OTHER INFORMATION—Describe any behavior you feel is especially indicative of outstanding personal traits or of student's potential for intellectual and/or personal growth.

HEALTH—Are there any health factors (physical or emotional) of which college should be aware if student matriculates?

.....No .....Yes (please explain)

SCHOOL ACTIVITIES RECORD

Activity	In what grade?	Positions—Offices held Indicate year

HONORS; INDEPENDENT ACTIVITIES

WORK EXPERIENCE—(specify summer jobs)

EDUCATIONAL INTERESTS—In what subject(s) or area(s) is student:

most interested?

least interested?

Signature _____ Title _____ Length of acquaintance with student _____

© Copyright 1963 by the National Association of Secondary-School Principals of the NEA, Washington, D. C. All rights reserved.
This blank, or any parts thereof, may not be reproduced except by permission.

PRELIMINARY REVISION

LAST NAME FIRST NAME MIDDLE INITIAL

SECONDARY SCHOOL RECORD: Additional information on _____

ADDITIONAL SCHOOL ACTIVITIES, HONORS, INDEPENDENT ACTIVITIES, WORK EXPERIENCE

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND INFORMATION FROM THE SCHOOL

83

© Copyright 1963 by the National Association of Secondary-School Principals of the NEA, Washington, D. C. All rights reserved.
This blank, or any parts thereof, may not be reproduced except by permission.

PRELIMINARY REVISION

APPENDIX D

THE 1964 EDITION OF THE SECONDARY SCHOOL RECORD

1. Student Description Form
2. Secondary School Record: Transcript and Student Description Summary

STUDENT DESCRIPTION FORM

STUDENT'S NAME _____ GRADE _____

TEACHER'S NAME _____ SUBJECT _____ DATE _____

The purpose of this form is to obtain a description of this student's behavior in your classroom. Answer all items by placing a check opposite the statement or phrase that best describes the student's behavior. Mark only one descriptive category for each item. Do not place a check between categories.

If you are filling out forms for more than one student, the ideal procedure is to complete a single item for all students before proceeding to the next item. That is, complete item one for all students, then item two for all students, and so forth through item eight.

For more detailed explanation of each item, consult the Manual for the Secondary-School Record.

(1) PARTICIPATION IN DISCUSSION

This item pertains only to spontaneous or self-initiated participation in class discussions. Do not consider quality of student's contribution (this will be reflected in other items), but only his level of active participation.

____ involved in almost every class discussion; often initiates discussion by some question or comment

____ usually participates; active in over 75% of class discussions

____ often participates; active in 50-75% of discussions

____ occasionally participates; active in 25-50% of discussions

____ seldom participates; active in less than 25% of discussions

____ item not applicable to this class

(2) INVOLVEMENT IN CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES

A student may be involved, even though he seldom participates orally. Describe student's usual degree of involvement in class activities—lectures, group projects, individual projects done during class time, etc.

____ very high; alert and attentive throughout the period; expresses interest in *all* activities

____ active involvement; usually shows some signs of genuine interest during class sessions

____ mild; is politely attentive but seldom exhibits any real interest or enthusiasm

____ languid interest; attention wanders frequently

____ distracted; often spends time doing other things during class

____ vacillates greatly; interest level seems to fluctuate markedly

(3) PURSUIT OF INDEPENDENT STUDY

To what extent has student shown concrete evidence of independent study or projects done on own initiative?

____ evidence of considerable study *and* at least one major project

____ considerable study *or* has completed a major project

____ some study *and* minor project(s)

____ some study *or* minor project(s)

____ no evidence that student has done independent study or project

____ item not applicable to this class

(4) EVENNESS OF PERFORMANCE

How even has the quality of student's work been over various class assignments and examinations?

____ exceptionally consistent; work never varies significantly

____ even; quality of work never varies more than one mark

____ slightly uneven; often varies one mark and occasionally more

____ uneven; often varies two full marks and occasionally more

____ erratic; work fluctuates greatly

(5) CRITICAL AND QUESTIONING ATTITUDE

To what extent is student critical of others' opinions? Consider only the extent, not the validity, of his critical attitude.

____ often challenges others' opinions or interpretations

____ sometimes challenges others

____ occasionally is skeptical or suggests "equally valid" opinions

____ sometimes probes for reasoning behind statements or opinions

____ rarely questions anything in a probing or skeptical way

____ item not applicable to this class

(6) DEPTH OF UNDERSTANDING

Grades do not always reflect "flair" for a subject. This item concerns insight into the essential structure of subject matter, beyond factual mastery.

____ excellent insight; shows unusual appreciation of the "fine points"

____ good understanding; manipulates concepts with ease

____ some insight; understands but cannot manipulate concepts easily

____ little insight; aware of but does not fully grasp basic concepts

____ poor understanding of subject

____ item not applicable to this class

(7) PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

To what extent does student accept personal responsibility for his course work and classroom behavior?

____ always accepts fully

____ usually accepts fully

____ partially accepts

____ sometimes refuses and attributes responsibility elsewhere

____ often refuses to accept responsibility

(8) CONSIDERATION FOR OTHERS

To what extent does student show genuine consideration for the rights and feelings of others?

____ always considerate of others

____ usually considerate of others

____ courteous but little evidence of genuine consideration

____ sometimes inconsiderate

____ often inconsiderate and rude

____ no opportunity to observe

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Copyright, 1964, by The National Association of Secondary-School Principals, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036. All rights reserved.

SECONDARY-SCHOOL RECORD--TRANSCRIPT

STUDENT INFORMATION

Last Name | *First Name* | *Middle Name*

Home Address

Parent or Guardian

Previous Secondary School Attended (if any) | *Date Left*

Date of Birth | *Sex* | ☐ *Withdrew* ☐ *Was or Will Be Graduated* | *Month* *Year*

SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name

School Address

School Accredited By ☐ *State System* ☐ *Reg. Accred. Assoc.* | *School Phone Number*

PUBLIC	NON-PUBLIC	*Enrollment in Grades —12*	*Percent Graduates Entering College* 4 Yr. Col.	2 Yr. Col. and Other
☐	☐			

Passing Mark	*Honors Mark (if any)*	LOWEST NUMERICAL EQUIVALENT A	B	C	D

CLASS RECORD

Include Subjects Failed or Repeated

YEAR	SUBJECTS	IDENTIFY LAB TV SEMINAR SUMMER	IDENTIFY HONORS ACCEL AD. PL. ETC.	MARKS 1ST. SEM.	MARKS FINAL OR 2ND. SEM.	CRED OR UNIT	STATE EXAM. SCORES
9							
19___							
19___							
10							
19___							
19___							
11							
19___							
19___							
12							
19___							
19___							

EXPLANATION OF HONORS COURSES

RANK IN CLASS

BASED ON_____SEMESTERS

☐ EXACTLY ☐ APPROX. _____ IN CLASS OF _____

FINAL RANK _____

Check Appropriate Rank Information

☐ ALL SUBJECTS GIVEN CREDIT ☐ ALL STUDENTS

☐ MAJOR SUBJECTS ONLY ☐ COLL. PREP. STUDENTS ONLY

Explain Weighting of Marks in Determining Rank

OUTSTANDING ACTIVITIES, HONORS, AWARDS

TEST RECORD

DATE	NAME OF TEST	RAW OR STD. SCORE	PERCENTILE SCORE	NORM GROUP	DATE	NAME OF TEST	RAW OR STD. SCORE	PERCENTILE SCORE	NORM GROUP

Date *Signature* *Title*

REPRESENTATIVES OF AACRAO, ACAC, ASCA AND NASSP HAVE COOPERATED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS FORM.
COPYRIGHT, 1964, BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY-SCHOOL PRINCIPALS, 1201 SIXTEENTH STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D. C., 20036. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

SECONDARY-SCHOOL RECORD—STUDENT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

88

Last Name	*First Name*	*Middle Name*	*School*	*State*

SUMMARY OF DESCRIPTIVE SCALES

(specify number at each level)

SUMMARIZED BELOW ARE THE DESCRIPTIONS MADE BY TEACHERS OF GRADE(S) ☐ 10 ☐ 11 ☐ 12

(1) PARTICIPATION IN DISCUSSION (SELF-INITIATED)

_____ always involved, often initiates discussion
_____ usually participates
_____ often participates
_____ occasionally participates
_____ seldom participates
_____ not applicable

(2) INVOLVEMENT IN CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES

_____ very high in all activities
_____ active, usually shows genuine interest
_____ mild, politely attentive
_____ languid, attention often wanders
_____ distracted, does other things during class
_____ vacillates greatly

(3) PURSUIT OF INDEPENDENT STUDY

_____ considerable study and major project(s)
_____ considerable study or major project(s)
_____ some study and minor project(s)
_____ some study or minor project(s)
_____ no evidence of independent study
_____ not applicable

(4) EVENNESS OF PERFORMANCE

_____ exceptionally consistent
_____ even, varies no more than one mark
_____ slightly uneven, often varies one mark
_____ uneven, often varies two marks
_____ erratic, performance fluctuates greatly

(5) CRITICAL AND QUESTIONING ATTITUDE

_____ often challenges
_____ sometimes challenges
_____ occasionally is skeptical
_____ sometimes probes
_____ rarely questions
_____ not applicable

(6) DEPTH OF UNDERSTANDING

_____ excellent insight
_____ good understanding
_____ some insight
_____ little insight
_____ poor understanding
_____ not applicable

(7) PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

_____ always accepts fully
_____ usually accepts fully
_____ partially accepts
_____ sometimes refuses
_____ often refuses

(8) CONSIDERATION FOR OTHERS

_____ always considerate of others' rights and feelings
_____ usually considerate
_____ courteous, little evidence of consideration
_____ sometimes inconsiderate
_____ often inconsiderate
_____ inadequate opportunity to observe

COMMENTS

HEALTH DO YOU KNOW OF ANY HEALTH FACTORS (PHYSICAL OR EMOTIONAL) OF WHICH THIS COLLEGE SHOULD BE AWARE IF THIS STUDENT MATRICULATES?
☐ NO ☐ YES *(Please Explain on Separate Sheet)*

RECOMMENDATION TO COLLEGE *If school policy precludes any recommendation, please check here* ☐

Date *Signature* *Title*

REPRESENTATIVES OF AACRAO, ACAC, ASCA AND NASSP HAVE COOPERATED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS FORM.
COPYRIGHT, 1984, BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY-SCHOOL PRINCIPALS, 1201 SIXTEENTH STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D. C., 20036. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

APPENDIX E

CONTENT ANALYSIS OF 1360 PERSONALITY RECORDS

CONTENT ANALYSIS OF THE NASSP PERSONALITY RECORD

	Amherst College	U. of Michigan	Rutgers	Women's College U. of N.C.	Total
(1) Number of Forms	258	119	468	515	1360

(2) Rating Scales: Marking System Used

Multiple checks - uses at least two checks per scale to indicate ratings	362
Numbers - uses numbers to indicate number of raters at each point	364
One check unspecified - no indication of rater or meaning of check is given	565
M used alone - one check or mark used which is specified as a model rating	18
Raters specified - use of legend to indicate specific teachers doing the rating; or subject areas indicated instead of checks on scale	8
More than 10 raters - more than 10 checks per scale or numbers totaling more than 10 per scale	31
One rater specified - single check or mark used and rater is identified	1
M per instructions - indication of model rating superimposed on scale having multiple checks or numbers	45
Mixed - use of single checks on some scales and multiple checks or numbers on others	14

(3) Scale Interpretation (forms included only where interpretation is unquestionable)

Discrete points - rater considers scale as five discrete points. Numbers or checks are written on or next to points	553
Continuum - rater considers scale as a continuum. Checks or numbers are at any point along scale	458

CONTENT ANALYSIS (continued)

	N
(4) Scale Omissions	
Scales incomplete - one or more scales omitted	3
Scales unused - entire rating scale section unused	31
(5) Significant School Activities	
Unspecified activities - very general statement, such as "clubs, sports," "very active"	31
Unidentified activities - local club names meaningless to outsider, ("Ansta," "College office")	65
Time in activity - specifies the number of years or what grades subject participated in activity	433
Function in activity - notes subject's specific contribution or function, office held, etc. (Do not tally here if mentions only a position on a sports team and not in other activities)	453
Information on separate sheet - notes that this information is on transcript or other sheet	57
(6) Significant Limitations	
Inappropriate information - gives information which is not relevant to the question or obviously insignificant ("wears glasses") or which is not detailed enough for proper interpretation without follow-up ("excused from PE")	57
Omit or "None" - leaves question blank or writes in "None"	1212
(7) Additional Information - Financial or Work	
Inappropriate use - gives information inappropriate to question or questionably related. Record examples on a separate sheet	30
Omit or "None" - leaves question blank or writes "None"	780
(8) Unsolicited Information Given for Items 5-7	
Outside activities - lists outside (of school) activities of student	162

	N
Family background - gives information on family background or problems which are not obviously appropriate to any of the questions. ("His father is an invalid" "He moved here only this year")	99
Other - other unsolicited information not included in 28 or 29. Note on a separate sheet	29

(9) Principal's Recommendation

Character and personality - response is predominantly concerned with the subject's character or personality rather than scholastic ability or qualifications. Include here, however, comments relating capabilities to achievement. (For example, "He works up to his abilities," or "He is capable of much more than he does"). Include also explanations of reasons for scholastic difficulties	609
Scholastic - response is predominantly concerned with subject's scholastic achievement or intellectual capabilities. ("He is a very bright boy," or "He has the ability to do college work")	314
General statement - response is a very general statement of recommendation, essentially saying nothing about the student per se. ("I believe he will be successful," or "Recommended with pleasure")	251
Repeats information - repeats information which is available elsewhere, such as grades, SAT scores, rank in class, school activities, etc.	46
Recommendation for specific school - definitely considers the particular school involved in making recommendation. Must be definite and obvious, such as naming the school, or indicating in some manner that the recommendation concerns the student's fitness for that school	121
Information separate sheet - notes that other sheet is attached or information written elsewhere	92

(10) Principal's Rating of Probable Success (checks between categories counted with the lower adjacent category)

Little success	6
May encounter some difficulty	72
Average	484
Above average	526

	N
Superior	164
Rating omitted	84
Two ratings indicated	24

(11) Principal's Checked Recommendation

Recommended	1171
Not recommended for this college	14
Prefer not to make a recommendation	32
Rating omitted	136
Two ratings indicated	7

(12) Title of Respondent

Principal, or any title indicating head or assistant to head of school	654
Guidance counselor	667
Other	25

APPENDIX F

ANALYSIS OF SELECTED QUESTIONS FROM A COLLEGE SURVEY ON "ADMISSIONS INTANGIBLES"

COLLEGE QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

Questionnaire prepared by Dale E. Remaly and sent to approximately 200 colleges and universities in January of 1960. Returns were received from 169 institutions. A statistical description of this sample (N=169) and tabulated results from selected questions are given below.

Description of the Sample

Location	%
East	58
Middle West	27
Far West	7
South	8

Type of Institution	%
Men's colleges	16
Women's colleges	20
Coeducational schools	62
Not given	2

Size	%
Less than 500	14
500 - 1000	34
1000 - 2500	27
2500 - 5000	9
Over 5000	14
Not given	2

Selection Ratio	%
.20 or less	10
.21 - .33	31
.34 - .50	30
.68 or above	25
Not given	4

Question 1

What increase (if any) do you anticipate in completed applications over the next several years?

	%
Greater than 15% increase	23
Some - up to 15% increase	56
No change or decrease	14
Information not given	7

Question 2

Let us assume that some liberal arts colleges and universities gradually acquire better students each year until virtually all who apply are academically acceptable but only a small percent can be accommodated. (Q-2A) Would you need more information about candidates personally ... behavior patterns, motivation, character, etc.? (Q-2B) From what sources, in order of choice, would you expect to solicit this information?

Q-2A	%
Yes	78
No	15
Not given	7

Q-2B (first choice only	%
School: counselors, principals, teachers	74
Alumni	4
Personal interview	4
Other: references, etc.	4
Not given	14

COLLEGE QUESTIONNAIRE DATA (continued)

Question 3

How much meaningful evidence do you receive from high schools to make clear cut assessments of candidates? (tabulated by estimates of the amount of inadequate information received)

Inadequate Information	%
Over half inadequate	16
A fifth to a half inadequate	41
Less than a fifth inadequate	23
No response	20

Question 4

In what way could school counselors help colleges do a more accurate job of evaluating candidates?

Suggestions of How More Helpful	%
More information needed	3
More specific information needed	35
Evaluate in terms of specific college	22
More realistic, frank, truthful, etc.	28
Other	2
No response	10

Question 5

Regarding admissions intangibles, at the present time and in order of choice, if possible, what three personal characteristics are the most meaningful to you in assessing candidates?

Most Meaningful Characteristic (1st choice)	%
Drive and ambition	44
Character and citizenship	14
Personal adjustment and maturity	11
Good work habits	7
Desire to learn	7
Social adjustment	4
Scholarship and ability	4
Other	2
Not given	8

COLLEGE QUESTIONNAIRE DATA (continued)

Question 6

In the future do you feel there will be a gradual need for more anecdotal evidence of personality and motivational patterns?

	%
Yes	76
No	12
Not given	11

APPENDIX G

INTERVIEW WITH HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS AND
COUNSELOR RE: STUDENT SM

RE: Student SM

AB — To identify this tape, let me say that I am talking to the counselor of SM and will soon be talking to various of his teachers. . . . suppose I'm a new counselor in the school or a new teacher, I have student, SM. I don't know anything about him and I come to you and I say, "What kind of a person is he?" How would you describe this boy to a fellow teacher or counselor?

Counselor — I would say Sam is exceedingly interesting because he, himself is interested in so many things. He has not yet discovered his limit of improvability, and so he goes head on into any enterprise and I don't mean just research but I mean teaching himself new things. This he has done particularly in the field of languages. We've tried because we have a certain pride in the record of the school to prevent his taking college boards in areas in which he has had no formal education. We have not been able to persuade him not to do this.

AB — Does he buy books on his own?

Counselor — He buys books on his own, he teaches himself and then he goes and takes the college board examination and considers that as good a test as what he has done for himself as he can find anywhere.

AB — Is there anyone that helps him with this? Does he get tutors?

Counselor — So far as I know, no one.

. . .

AB — What are SM's most outstanding characteristics? Mr. C. can you start?

Math Teacher — Well, he's very bright and he has strong curiosity and a lot of motivation in the particular directions that he wants to go. He's not the kind of student that just pushes for grades or works necessarily hard at what the course prescription is. He's interested in certain things and these are the things that he likes to follow and he's very creative.

AB — You teach Math is that right? You find this true in---

Math Teacher — Oh, he has brought numerous things to me, things that he has thought up as far as I can tell on his own that are good.

AB — Solutions to problems---

Math Teacher — Not problems that I have assigned or even recommended but problems that he has discovered himself, that he's interested in working out. As a matter of fact, his work in the assigned work is sometimes as low as a C.

AB — He'll get C in the course work and then go out and do things on his own.

Latin Teacher — Yes, what Dave has said for Math follows very closely in Latin and I think in French also. Maggie and I have talked about this at times. He has in fact attempted to invent his own International Language, from which he has spent a great deal of time and yet he will come in unprepared for a major exam and get a C or a D in it. Which is some accomplishment even to get a C in a major Latin exam without obviously preparing for it. It means he can absorb a great deal just from listening in class. The time has not been spent in a wasteful pursuit in his own feeling but in very important things that he's interested in.

. . .

French Teacher — I agree with Mrs. _____'s analysis there very definitely. He is a very personable person. He has a personable character in the sense that he has a good sense of humor. He's very much aware of his own failings in this matter. This is something that I have noticed and he makes efforts to improve his organization of his own homework and study program, etc. But he is such a curious person and so interested in so many things that he can't stay on the beaten track and so as a result, his interests get diversified and for me he did a very involved lengthy paper this year. His French research paper, which I read word for word on the development of romance languages from Latin and he compared French, Portugese, Spanish, Italian, to the original Latin word. It was sixty pages long - typed - as an example of the quantity of work in which he is capable, it's fantastic. It was all good work. A little dry, a little dull and there were many things that could have been done to have made it a little clearer in its presentation but still a great deal of ability. I think he has what I call a latent talent, that just has not come right to the surface all the time in languages very definitely.

AB — How about your reactions now Mr. _____?

Physics Teacher — I have Sam in physics and he's in the honors physics class. And Sam impresses me as, he's awfully anxious to impress people and this is the feeling I get, very anxious to impress people and because of this many times I have a feeling that maybe his ability isn't as great as he may be laboring under a - in some type of an inferiority complex or something. I don't know but many times I feel that he's really not actually as bright as he'd like everybody to think he is.

AB — A little bit of a dilettante maybe?

Physics Teacher — Yes, and there's no question in may mind that he has a lot of ability because he does good work and he's also becoming, I think, more concerned with the people around him than he was in the beginning of the year. He's very anxious for the people in the class to know that he's there.

AB — You mean his peers? His teachers, or both?

Physics Teacher — Well, his teachers I know, he's very anxious for his teachers to recognize him, but I think he's becoming more concerned with the peers than he was before.

Latin Teacher — But for not to get grades you see. He wants the teacher to be aware of what he's thinking. But it's not to get a grade which is different from the rest of the students which is one of the reasons he stands out.

French Teacher — Also, he's very sensitive to other peoples' feelings.

. . .

AB — Tell me, when you say he's sensitive to people, does this communicate anything to his friends? Do you think his peers look on him as a warm person, do they---

Mixed Voices — No, they don't feel it, they laugh at him.

AB — They laugh at Sam?

French Teacher — He's different.

Latin Teacher — In Latin IV where I have him, they are not nasty to him in any way but I have noticed more and more, they turn off their ears when he starts to make a comment because they say it's going to be way out.

French Teacher — They ignore him.

Physics Teacher — They know he's trying to make an impression.

AB — Then you would say he is not a boy of a great many friends?

Latin Teacher — No, I don't think so, I don't think he has a lot of friends.

French Teacher — I think he's a loner. He's very much alone.

. . .

Latin Teacher — He can't write an essay question.

French Teacher — But, he can write poetry.

Latin Teacher — Yes, but he cannot organize an essay question at all.

Counselor — Part of that problem is that he took his English IV in summer school last year, you see, and he came in early this fall and he said, "I have found out I can't write. What can I do about it?" and I said, "Well, what made you ever suppose that in six weeks time you could learn to write when seniors are going to spend a year doing it?" Well, then he wanted help at once.

AB — How about his day by day work in your course? Does he do the day by day work there or does he go off on these tangents?

Physics Teacher — No, he does it. He does good work too. Occasionally he'll get off on an interest and let it go for awhile but he'll come back and bring it up.

French Teacher — He does it at his speed.

Physics Teacher — Right, once in a while he'll - he won't be ready for tests and get a low score and then the next time he'll come back with an A. If he's doing something else he lets the physics go for a while.

AB — Would you say he's an independent boy then?

Physics Teacher — Extremely.

Latin Teacher — He's willing to take the lower grade so that he can do---

Physics Teacher — And he doesn't mind being a nonconformist. I think he enjoys being a nonconformist. In fact, he wants everybody to know that he is.

AB — What about his maturity then? How would you characterize this youngster?

French Teacher — I think he's growing this year.

Latin Teacher — Yes, I've had him for two years now and I think there has been growth over the two years. Well, now he has an ability to relate what he learns in one class to another class, which is rare. We read a phrase in Virgil of a character who was reviewing the future. Now the idea of reviewing something which is going to come, brought up the relativity of time. Well, the next day Sam was in front of the board with a physics problem to prove to us that time is relative. Now it was very well worked out and

Latin Teacher (cont'd) he had spent a great deal of time on preparing so that he could teach it to the lay thought in the class, which is a group of giggling girls. They didn't know what was going on and yet he got the point across to them. I had not said anything about it and yet he was prepared the next day with it. Now this is rare in a student.

Physics Teacher He can relate subjects very well, I think.

Mixed Voices Agree he can relate subjects very well and he relates between two languages all the time.

. . .

Latin Teacher Well, I think to major in languages he would have the problem of the day by day constant attention to detail which is required of good language knowledge, and that day to dayness is hard for him.

AB Well, what is he motivated for then? Is he motivated to do something but what is he motivated for? Would you call him a motivated boy?

Latin Teacher A curious boy.

French Teacher Self motivated. I don't know whether he's motivated toward any one career at the present time. I think he's still feeling his way. I think he's listed careers in his folder. I get the feeling that he thinks there's a wide open field in liberal arts and that languages are one of the keys to these fields. I don't think he's going to tie himself down, at this point.

. . .

Latin Teacher Well, he wrote a Latin poem as a project. This is rough in dactylic hexameter and he knew it was rough. It was about a 20-line poem but he violated one of the major points of poetry which is a small detail about the fifth foot but it wrecked every line.

Math Teacher I had thought. We've talked a little bit about his lack of organization in his work and there's something about Sam that seems contradictory at this point, and that is that he types his notes. In spite of the fact that he doesn't organize papers well (his handwriting is horrible, which is his explanation for why he does type everything), he takes notes home and types them. He hands math homework in typed on occasion.

AB This is somewhat contradictory.

Latin Teacher Well now he typed the translation for the whole sixth book of The Aeneid but he typed it four days before the test was due. He had not done it day by day, so that there's a disorganization and organization in one incident, because he typed it four days before the exam - and

Latin Teacher (cont'd): night and day. The children told me Sam's been up three nights for this test, typing the notes, which if he had done day by day, would have been a quick review before the test.

. . .

Latin Teacher: From what progress Maggie and I have seen in him over the last two years, I think he's going up as far as maturity goes. I think he's a late bloomer as far as maturity goes because of these tremendous interests he has had.

French Teacher: And I don't think the nonconformity that he has is an obnoxious kind of nonconformity at all. It's been mentioned that he's a nonconformist, but not the kind that rubs you the wrong way as another student or as a professor in a University might be annoyed. I think it's the kind that intellectual curiosity here, which just puts him in a different category from maybe the way you're thinking, or somebody else is thinking. I think in a Liberal Arts program or a large University, he would do all right.

Latin Teacher: I think his only weakness would be this problem in English of writing.

Physics Teacher: Yes, as opposed to many other students, comparing him with other students who do well in college, I'd say he should make it on a comparative basis- do well.

. . .

AB: Go on, now you were in the middle of describing Sam after--

Counselor: Oh, I forget where I was--

AB: I think as I remember it, he didn't know his limitations sometimes and he just would jump into everything thinking he could take College Board exams in them.

Counselor: I think so, he's feeling his way. I think when we ask a student of this sort to come to decisions too soon - to make him jell - we limit him and we shouldn't. There are people who claim that we do that and all through the grades you see, you get a creative child who began to write poetry, and suddenly all this creativity vanishes because we've imposed something else. Now Sam does not let anybody impose that upon him and I'm glad he doesn't.

AB: What about his creativity? Tell me a little more about this - what you've seen of it and--

Counselor: I know of it only by heresay. I don't think he's ever brought me a piece of his work. But he was writing his lyrics and then he was going to write something (I don't know whether I put it down) - he was going

Counselor (cont'd) to write lyrics for Tschaikovsky's First Symphony. He says in politics (he told me this himself) he's left of center and he had reviewed the House on American Activities Committee and he was taking a public opinion poll at school about his to see how many people felt as he did I guess about the activities of the Committee.

AB Did he ever do anything with this report?

Counselor I didn't follow it up. . . . But he has belonged to our World Affairs Club which is an after-school club which indicates an interest because he takes his own time to do it. Then he has participated in the Debating Club too, and he belonged to the Student Peace Union.

. . .

AB Would you like to read some of the statements starting with 10th grade? Why don't you? You have 10th and 11th there?

Counselor Yes, I have 10th, 11th and 12th here.

AB Fine. Why don't we start with the 10th grade and if you just tell me the subject matter of the teacher--

Counselor Now would you want me to follow the subject through the three years rather than give the whole 10th grade picture at once? Shall I take all the Math in sequence?

AB No, let's just get the 10th picture.

Counselor This is the algebra - Sam has certainly displayed good ability and quick response in a class which as a part of the experimental program is a good one. His quickness may lead to the careless errors which plague him and hold his performance to an average or below level. He should develop the habit of careful reviews of his decisions. Latin II, after a slow start in Latin II, Sam's been gaining momentum. Occasionally the quality of his performance drops. For the remainder of the year he should be careful to do the consistently good work of which he is capable. Now this was dated March. This is English - Sam is doing average work in English. He seems to need a great amount of motivation. He could be an exceptional student if he worked up to his innate ability. There is a great variance in his grades. I feel that this is due to inconsistent study habits. History - Sam does not work very hard. His exam grades do not reflect his ability. He is very well read. French - Sam's work seems to be greatly a matter of his motivation at the moment; and when French is it, he is incomparable.

Counselor (cont'd)

Now this is 11th grade and there is no English report. Latin III - Sam has high language ability (a different teacher). When his application to work is steady his results are excellent. Sam has had some difficulty in adjusting to the comprehension type of test I give. I believe however, that practice in this very necessary type of test will improve Sam's test results. This is French II - Again a different teacher. Samuel has greater interest in doing supplementary work rather than the required. His work suffers from lack of proper application. This is Geometry - Sam has the ability to do excellent work in geometry. His work habits could improve and a little more concentration on the material would be beneficial. He is a good thinker and he enjoys difficult problems.

Senior Year - Problems of Democracy - (the teacher who wasn't here) Sam seems to have a great deal of sensitivity and understanding in this subject matter field. He must, however, learn the discipline of organized study and written expression. French IV - Sam's interest in French should help him achieve the mastery of this language that he wants. He must be careful to write and speak accurately so that he can avoid careless mistakes. It is a pleasure to be his teacher. Physics - Sam is doing excellent work in the honors physics class. Math - Sam has an inquiring mind and keen mathematical insight. These will permit him to enjoy unusual successes in mathematics if he is willing to master the necessary fundamentals. He needs to spend more effort on the course material. His work habits also need improvement. Latin IV - sometimes I feel Sam is too deep for us. In some of his understanding of Virgil he sees so clearly - better than we do. At other times I feel Sam is careless in the fundamentals of Latin. His performance is good in Virgil, though it varies. I enjoy his spark in class. It keeps us on our toes.

APPENDIX H

LIST OF PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS IN THE NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL PRETEST STUDY

LIST OF PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS IN THE HIGH SCHOOL PRETEST STUDY

	School	City	State
1)	San Diego H. S.	San Diego	California
2)	Palo Alto Senior H.S.	Palo Alto	California
3)	Eisenhower H.S.	Rialto	California
4)	La Jolla Jr-Sr H.S.	La Jolla	California
5)	Anaheim H.S.	Anaheim	California
6)	Fontana H.S.	Fontana	California
7)	St. Ignatius H.S.	San Francisco	California
8)	Brea-Olinda H.S.	Brea	California
9)	San Marcos H.S.	Santa Barbara	California
10)	Fullerton H.S.	Fullerton	California
11)	Santa Barbara H.S.	Santa Barbara	California
12)	Capuchino H.S.	San Bruno	California
13)	Burlingame H.S.	Burlingame	California
14)	San Marino H.S.	San Marino	California
15)	Sunny Hills H.S.	Fullerton	California
16)	Harry L. Ells H.S.	Richmond	California
17)	San Mateo H.S.	San Mateo	California
18)	Oakland H.S.	Oakland	California
19)	Oakland Technical H.S.	Oakland	California
20)	Castlemont H.S.	Oakland	California
21)	Freemond H.S.	Oakland	California
22)	William Overfelt H.S.	San Jose	California
23)	James Lick H.S.	San Jose	California
24)	Classical H.S.	Worchester	Massachusetts
25)	South H.S.	Worchester	Massachusetts
26)	Hopedale H.S.	Hopedale	Massachusetts
27)	Auburn H.S.	Auburn	Massachusetts
28)	Golden Valley H.S.	Minneapolis	Minnesota
29)	Wayzata H.S.	Wayzata	Minnesota
30)	North H.S.	Minneapolis	Minnesota
31)	Mounds View H.S.	New Brighton	Minnesota
32)	Northrop Collegiate H.S.	Minneapolis	Minnesota
33)	Robbinsdale H.S.	Robbinsdale	Minnesota
34)	Marshall H.S.	Minneapolis	Minnesota
35)	Blake School	Hopkins	Minnesota
36)	Richfield Senior H.S.	Richfield	Minnesota
37)	St. Louis Park Senior H.S.	St. Louis Park	Minnesota
38)	Washburn H.S.	Minneapolis	Minnesota
39)	Missoula County H.S.	Missoula	Montana
40)	Custer County H.S.	Miles City	Montana
41)	Helena Senior H.S.	Helena	Montana
42)	Culbertson H.S.	Culbertson	Montana
43)	Bloomfield Senior H.S.	Bloomfield	New Jersey
44)	Verona H.S.	Verona	New Jersey
45)	Memorial H.S.	Cedar Grove	New Jersey
46)	Central H.S. of Hopewell	Pennington	New Jersey
47)	Valhalla H.S.	Valhalla	New York
48)	Seaford H.S.	Seaford, L. I.	New York
49)	Bay Shore H.S.	Bay Shore, L. I.	New York
50)	Bishop Loughlin H.S.	Brooklyn	New York

	School	City	State
51)	Xaverian H.S.	Brooklyn	New York
52)	Nyack H.S.	Nyack	New York
53)	Roslyn H.S.	Roslyn	New York
54)	Holy Trinity H.S.	Brooklyn	New York
55)	Scarsdale H.S.	Scarsdale	New York
56)	St. Agnas H.S.	College Point	New York
57)	Hicksville Senior H.S.	Hicksville, L.I.	New York
58)	Bronxville H.S.	Bronxville	New York
59)	Lafayette H.S.	Brooklyn	New York
60)	Midwood H.S.	Brooklyn	New York
61)	Brooklyn Technical H.S.	Brooklyn	New York
62)	Bronx H.S. of Science	Bronx	New York
63)	Wy-east H.S.	Hood River	Oregon
64)	Lebanon H.S.	Lebanon	Oregon
65)	Seaside H.S.	Seaside	Oregon
66)	Franklin H.S.	Portland	Oregon
67)	Lincoln H.S.	Portland	Oregon
68)	Washington H.S.	Portland	Oregon
69)	Williamette H.S.	Eugene	Oregon
70)	Junction City H.S.	Junction City	Oregon
71)	Stayton Union H.S.	Stayton	Oregon
72)	South Salem H.S.	Salem	Oregon
73)	Madison H.S.	Portland	Oregon
74)	Coquille H.S.	Coquille	Oregon
75)	Bend Senior H.S.	Bend	Oregon
76)	Roosevelt H.S.	Portland	Oregon
77)	Albany H.S.	Albany	Oregon
78)	Wilson H.S.	Portland	Oregon
79)	Governor Misslin H.S.	Shillington	Pennsylvania
80)	Abington Senior H.S.	Abington	Pennsylvania
81)	Havertown Senior H.S.	Havertown	Pennsylvania
82)	Cheltenham Senior H.S.	Wyncote	Pennsylvania
83)	North Penn H.S.	Lansdale	Pennsylvania
84)	Petersburg H.S.	Petersburg	Virginia
85)	Thomas Dale H.S.	Chester	Virginia
86)	Hermitage H.S.	Richmond	Virginia
87)	Benedictine H.S.	Richmond	Virginia
88)	Grange H.S.	Moseley	Virginia
89)	Armstrong H.S.	Richmond	Virginia
90)	Thomas Jefferson H.S.	Richmond	Virginia
91)	John Marshall H.S.	Richmond	Virginia
92)	Maggie L. Walker H.S.	Richmond	Virginia
93)	George Wythe H.S.	Richmond	Virginia
* 94)	Galileo H.S.	San Francisco	California
* 95)	Orono H.S.	Long Lake	Minnesota
* 96)	Minnetonka H.S.	Exelsior	Minnesota
* 97)	Centennial H.S.	Gresham	Oregon
* 98)	Hopewell H.S.	Hopewell	Virginia
** 99)	Beverly Hills H.S.	Beverly Hills	California
** 100)	Grant H.S.	Portland	Oregon

*Data received late; SDFs not in analysis
**No Counselor Questionnaires returned; SDFs are in analysis

APPENDIX I

HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELOR QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS

H.S. COUNSELOR QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS
(Based on Data from 93 Schools; N=192)

	Total % (N=192)	% in Design A&C (N=160)	% in Design B (N=30)
1. Do you think that the new descriptive scales provide valuable information for transcript purposes?			
VERY VALUABLE	58	55	72
SOMEWHAT VALUABLE	35	37	25
NOT VERY VALUABLE	3	3	-
OMIT	5	5	3
2. Would the descriptive scale information be useful to have for all students in the school, for counseling or instructional purposes?			
VERY USEFUL	54	56	44
SOMEWHAT USEFUL	36	34	50
NOT VERY USEFUL	6	7	3
OMIT	4	4	3
3. In the summary of the descriptive ratings do you think it is important to record the honors and advanced placement courses separately?			
YES	67	66	72
NO	27	28	25
OMIT	6	7	3
4. In the summary of descriptive ratings, do you think it is important to record the descriptions obtained from different years separately?			
YES	64	67	50
NO	31	28	47
OMIT	5	5	3
5. In general, do you think the revised Secondary-School Record would be a useful transcript for employers?			
VERY USEFUL	39	38	41
SOMEWHAT USEFUL	44	44	47
NOT VERY USEFUL	10	11	6
OMIT	7	8	6

H.S. COUNSELOR QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS
(Based on Data from 93 Schools; N=192)

Scale Questions	Total % (N=192)	% in Design A&C (N=160)	% in Design B (N=30)
6. Do you feel the revised Secondary-School Record is appropriate for most schools and colleges, or do you feel it is biased toward a particular group of schools and/or colleges?			
GENERALLY APPROPRIATE	90	89	94
SOMEWHAT BIASED (PLEASE EXPLAIN)	5	6	3
OMIT	5	6	3
7. Did you find it difficult to provide the kind of information requested in the two "free-response" questions of the School Report?			
VERY DIFFICULT	--	--	13
SOMEWHAT DIFFICULT	--	--	41
NOT VERY DIFFICULT	--	--	22
OMIT	--	--	25
Policy Questions			
8. What is your personal feeling about writing statements of recommendation for students?			
IN FAVOR	57	55	69
OPPOSED	21	24	9
NEUTRAL	17	18	13
OMIT	4	3	9
9. What is your personal feeling about checking statements of recommendation for students?			
IN FAVOR	49	49	47
OPPOSED	30	33	19
NEUTRAL	17	15	28
OMIT	4	3	6
10. On a school transcript, do you think the school should provide information about the student's activities, honors, and work experience?			
YES	67	64	78
NO	28	30	16
OMIT	6	6	6

APPENDIX J

TEACHER COMMENTS REGARDING THE DESCRIPTIVE SCALES

TEACHERS COMMENTS

SUMMARY

Total favorable comments	— 95
Total unfavorable comments	— 98
Complaints re specific subjects	— 9
Suggestions re procedure	— 39
Suggestions re content	— 35

GENERAL COMMENTS

Favorable (26)		Unfavorable (44)	
Superior to present rating forms	(9)	All rating forms are a waste of time and unnecessary	(6)
Valuable if used as it should be used	(3)	All rating forms are invalid and unfair	(10)
A step in the right direction	(2)	Too time consuming for results obtained	(23)
A good form	(8)	Judgments are evaluative in some cases, not descriptive	(4)
Adequate	(3)	Still a tendency toward "good-bad" ratings	(1)
Scales are better than anecdotal comments	(1)		

DESCRIPTIVE MATERIAL AND SDF

Favorable (41)		Unfavorable (29) (too detailed, too vague, etc.)	
Easy to understand	(3)	Too detailed	(5)
Comprehensive, precise, and meaningful coverage of behavior	(15)	Too much	(5)
Easy to fill out	(9)	Items overlap	(1)
Accurate and helpful descriptions of scales and rating	(9)	Too flowery and too much jargon	(2)
Good rationale behind formulation of form	(4)	Manual not necessary / is useless	(2)
Place for comment is valuable	(1)	Too difficult to comprehend	(1)
		Complicated	(1)
		Categories too vague, broad, general	(8)
		Too unrealistic for some subjects (shop)	(1)
		Confusion over "global evaluation"	(1)
		Confusion over middle categories -- high and low were clear	(1)
		Confusion over whom to compare the student with (classmates or other teenagers)	(1)

TEACHERS COMMENTS

USEFULNESS OF DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

Favorable (28)		Unfavorable (25)	
Useful for teacher in rating	(7)	Is valuable only for good classes -- not slow ones	(1)
Useful for guidance	(3)	Does not describe adequately relations with fellow students	(1)
Useful for employers	(2)	The form does not allow for a course which has several aspects	(1)
Useful for College Admissions people	(5)	Items on Motivation are not accurate	(1)
Useful for pinpointing the students capabilities within a given course	(1)	Items vary with teachers, class, subject	(1)
Useful for teacher for reference (problem students, placing students, etc.)	(6)	Cannot judge every student in every area	(3)
		May be a difference of interpretation of scales	(2)
		Dangerous	(1)
Useful especially for honors classes	(1)	Items 7-12 does not permit accurate description for average Teacher	(1)
Useful for administrative personnel	(1)	Does not allow for relative behavior --is too factual	(5)
		Impossible to be completely objective	(2)
Especially good for some particular subjects (art)	(1)	Should be more categories	(4)
		There are many things it does not and cannot cover	(1)
Items 7-12 especially valuable	(1)	Too many scales and categories	(1)

SUBJECT AREA COMPLAINTS (Scales inappropriate)

Dramatics	(1)
Activity courses (newspaper and yearbook)	(1)
Business subjects	(1)
Languages	(5)
Music	(1)

TEACHERS COMMENTS

SUGGESTIONS FOR PROCEDURE

Put student's name on same side of sheet as scale ratings	(5)
Add "not included above" to each category	(1)
Add a place to mark "Confidential" if the teacher desires	(1)
Add a place for teacher to sign her name	(1)
Condense the material: a) combine manual and questionnaire on a single sheet	(3)
b) fewer scales	(1)
c) fewer ratings	(1)
d) condense the manual to a single double-fold sheet	(5)
e) omit manual completely	(1)
Arrange scales so that they can be read in continuity narratively	(1)
Provide space near each check point for a running description	(1)
Summarize forms in some way to be used as reference for teachers	(1)
Change to a short answer form with specific questions	(1)
Mark results on an IBM card	(1)
Make every attempt to show the importance and need for this form to evaluators	(1)
Give a pre-introduction of this form to faculty and students	(1)
Give the forms to the teacher early in the year	(5)
Make the ratings only once a year at mid-year or 3rd term	(1)
Rate all students on one item at a time	(3)
Emphasize that the teacher does not rate pupils on what is not known	(2)
Recommend teacher confer with student at least 5 times per year before rating him	(1)
Consider evaluation of "boys" separate from and more important than results of "girls" forms	(1)

TEACHERS COMMENTS

SUGGESTIONS FOR CONTENT

Needs scales for:

a) General Impression	(1)	j) Sense of Humor	(2)
b) Capability	(1)	k) Emotional Stability	(2)
c) Intellectual Curiosity	(2)	l) Attitude in General	(1)
d) Initiative	(1)	m) Classroom Citizenship (behavior)	(2)
e) Foresight	(1)	n) Social Maturity	(1)
f) Creativity and Imagination	(2)	o) Moral Responsibility (integrity, cheating)	(2)
g) Leadership	(1)	p) Attitude toward the specific subject	(1)
h) Temperament	(1)	q) Logical Thinking (abstract and concrete)	(3)
i) Character	(1)	r) Effort	(1)

Need an introductory question to find out how well the teacher knows the student (1)

Need a place to discuss possible student handicaps (race, religion, physical appearance and health) or extra-commendable traits (3)

Need a place to describe attendance (1)

Need to have a general evaluation of scholastic record (1)

Need a "no opportunity" section for <u>each</u> item (1)

Manual could deal with specific area of curriculum using terminology unique to each area (1)

Need a place for teacher's estimate of what student had done in the course with a comparison to what could have been done (1)

APPENDIX K

LIST OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS IN THE NATIONAL COLLEGE PRETEST STUDY

College Pretest Sample

(N = 82)

State	Sequence 1 Institutions	Sequence 2 Institutions
Alabama	Alabama College	
Arizona		University of Arizona
California	San Diego State College San Francisco State College	Pacific Union Pomona College Stanford University
Colorado		University of Denver
Connecticut	University of Hartford	University of Connecticut
District of Columbia	George Washington University	
Georgia	Emory University	
Illinois	Lake Forest College Northwestern University	Blackburn College De Pauw University Knox College
Indiana	Wabash College	Indiana University
Iowa	Cornell College	Drake University State University of Iowa Wartburg College
Kansas	University of Kansas	
Kentucky	Transylvania College	
Louisiana	Louisiana State University Loyola University	
Maine	Bates College	
Massachusetts	Boston College	Boston University University of Massachusetts
Michigan	Central Michigan University Wayne State University	Olivet College University of Michigan
Minnesota		Bemidji State College Carleton College
Missouri	University of Missouri	William Jewell College

State	Sequence 1 Institutions	Sequence 2 Institutions
Montana		College of Great Falls
Nebraska	Hastings College	Concordia Teachers College Union College
New Jersey	Fairleigh Dickinson	
New Mexico		University of New Mexico
New York	Hofstra University Ithaca College University of Buffalo	
North Carolina	Greensboro College North Carolina State College	Duke University
Ohio	Ashland College College of Wooster Denison University Whittenberg University	Bowling Green State Univ. Marietta College
Oklahoma		Oklahoma State University University of Tulsa
Oregon		Reed College
Pennsylvania	Bucknell University University of Pittsburgh Waynesburg College	Allegheny College Susquehanna University Temple University
South Dakota	State Univ. of South Dakota	
Tennessee		University of Tennessee Vanderbilt University
Texas	Abilene Christian College Rice University Trinity University	University of Houston
Vermont	Middlebury College	University of Vermont
Virginia	College of William & Mary Emory and Henry College	
Washington		University of Puget Sound
West Virginia		Davis and Elkins College W. V. Institute of Technology
Wisconsin	Marquette University	Carroll College

APPENDIX L

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE IN THE NATIONAL COLLEGE PRETEST

COLLEGE PRETEST SAMPLE

(N = 82)

Region & College Entrance Examination Board Membership

	Total N	CEEB N
East	19	15
South	21	11
Midwest	31	13
West	11	5
	82	44

Selectivity & College Entrance Examination Board Membership

% Applicants Admitted	Total N	CEEB N
0 - 50%	23	17
50 - 75%	33	19
75 - 100%	26	8
	82	44

Number of Applications Processed

	Total N
0 - 1500	40
1500 - 3500	19
Over 3500	21
Omit	2
	82

Selectivity by Number of Applications Processed

	0 to 1500	1500 3500	Over 3500
0 - 50%	11	3	8
50 - 75%	17	8	7
75 - 100%	12	8	6
	40	19	21

---

1) Regional representation in the sample of 82 institutions is generally adequate.

2) The sample seems fairly representative of different levels of selectivity, though the highly selective colleges are probably somewhat under-represented. (Only 3 colleges indicated that they admitted less than 25% of applicants.) CEEB membership is not a good index of selectivity.

3) There appears to be no relationship between selectivity and number of applications processed.

APPENDIX M

REACTIONS OF ADMISSIONS OFFICERS IN THE NATIONAL COLLEGE PRETEST

ADMISSIONS OFFICERS COMMENTS

GENERAL REACTIONS

I like it! (5)

Is easy to read and evaluate.

More room for entries means easier reading.

It is certainly easy to read and comprehensive compared to many we receive.

Wish colleges would agree to return all other forms and insist on "Approved" form.

Less chance for misstatement by clerical help at the school filling it out.

Less chance of injustice to a candidate through mechanical evaluation.

CPGA & NASSP should be compatible and I think they already are moving in that direction. They will be existing side by side for many years.

I like it very much. Just wonder if high schools will cooperate in giving all the information requested. I know they'd like to but wonder about time element.

I can appreciate that to use the total form (including the descriptive ratings) that the guidance counselor will have to do much more.

Excellent. But we wonder how many counselors in large schools would be needed to supply accurate and complete information on each student. There would have to be wholehearted cooperation between the counselors and the faculty.

The revised secondary school record is probably more meaningful to colleges that 1. are the most selective, 2. are interested most in student diversity. As more colleges begin to fall into this pattern, the revised form will become more meaningful and helpful in making intelligent admission decisions.

I definitely feel that the proposed secondary-school record is much too elaborate for those who will be required to fill it out. I feel that the information needed by various admissions officers differs a great deal and that to complete such a detailed form for all admissions officers would be needless. For example, in making use of a high school record, I look at-

1. the courses completed or in progress
2. the rank in class
3. the name of the student
4. the name of the school

All other information on the proposed form generally is not used by us in making an admissions decision.
Perhaps an alternative to the proposed form would be to have three different forms available which would differ from each other in the amount of detailed information requested. Each college could then choose the form which best meet its needs without causing undue burden to the high schools. In such an arrangement the form we would prefer would be one that asks for only that information we actually use. I would be happy to help on this project.

ADMISSIONS OFFICERS COMMENTS

CONTENT (NON-SCALE) AND ORGANIZATION COMMENTS

Glad to see item dealing with physical and emotional experience.

For records sent at end of Junior year it would help to report proposed Senior subjects, even unofficially to check on the specific pattern of subjects required by college.

Could attendance record appear on transcript on the bottom line of each year - substantiating evidence to accomplishment, health and attitude.

We consider the applicant's degree objective important when reviewing his file for admission.

What about a Counselor's check mark indicating that "student is applying to this school with my approval"

Easier to read if rank and size of class appear on one line.

Use same form as CPGA (Academic Summary section for Rank in Class Data

One grade for each course each year rather than one for each semester is perfectly adequate (Senior year there would be one first semester and a final one.)

I approve the format and the factual reporting of 12 items. I see no need for a specific recommendation which either assumes more precise knowledge of each college or simply a resume of facts already stated. I find the written statements interesting but I believe with practice I would be able to analyze the characteristics better and have a more precise description of the applicant.
I would prefer the SAT scores included with the test record. Perhaps because I lack experience in use of some of the test results given, I found too much included on some of the transcripts. I prefer a vertical tabulation to the horizontal method but usage would make a difference.
If the application form requires the student to list his activities, honors and work experience, it would seem feasible to omit that page and permit the comments on the descriptive rating page (if such statements were necessary.)
I look forward to the adoption of a standard form used by all high schools.

College certifying or recommending grade is good to retain. Should enable high schools to keep before students a goal if they desire to go to college.

It would help to have the "Descriptive Ratings" page attached to the others.

If we could have the essential school data on one sheet front and back we could save paper handling and filing. Combine descriptive ratings on same page as the record page of the transcript by eliminating or condensing such things as School Activities Record, Work Experience etc. (which we ask for in application)

Since CEEB, National Merit & ACT are widely given they should appear in the same spot on every transcript i.e., the bottom 3 lines of the Test Record section with the test titles preprinted.

ADMISSIONS OFFICERS COMMENTS

DESCRIPTIVE SCALE COMMENTS

It provides more information in a better organized fashion, the descriptive rating categories are more meaningful.

The College Manual and Descriptive Scales represent a real need for such - particularly in correlating all data received about each applicant.

The descriptive scales are sincerely the best I've ever seen to elicit the kind of information on student characteristics which I feel is really related to success in college. Admissions officers who are pressed for more objective selection of new students would welcome it if secondary schools would adopt secondary school record transcript forms used in part B.

I'm all for it as presented. Seems to provide, in a readily reviewed grasp of the situation, the information we are looking for in our University.
Very happy to have participated.
Seems very complete and adequate for our admissions processing.

Will take getting used to but will be able to make more intelligent decisions on the basis of these changes.

Puts the judgment on the admissions officer.

It is necessary to have more non-academic information on candidates, which questions should appear on the school record. Colleges need this information realizing the reluctance on the part of the secondary school in offering such information.

Don't like the complete absence of any descriptive rating indication of students "integrity" or honesty, called for on present personality form.

Note (questionnaire responses)..."somewhat meaningful," and "less meaningful." I'm sure part of my negative feeling is due to unfamiliarity and annoyance that it should take so long to interpret the meaning of the teachers with these unfamiliar categories. No doubt familiarity with the ratings and their meanings would remove a good deal of my objection.
My greatest fear is that only a small portion of the teachers requested to use this form will become familiar enough to use it without constant reference to the "manual." If this fear is valid, we will be trying to put meaning into ratings which some teachers will not take the time to make meaningful. Despite its shortcomings, I believe a simple top-to-bottom scales for the harassed, busy teacher will give us as much as a complex form on which the majority of teachers will not bother to give us conscientious answers.

I feel completely ignorant as to the character and integrity of these candidates. They certainly were not "people" to me as I viewed them. Perhaps our personal application would have helped but the Secondary record helped but little.

APPENDIX N

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR THE COMMUNICATIONS STUDY

INTERVIEW GUIDE

You may assure the school that all information will be regarded as strictly confidential and will be used for research purposes only. In any written report of the interview study, all identifying information will be omitted.

Student's Name _____ Interview recorded on tape # _____

School _____
Name Address

Number of teachers interviewed _____ Counselor interviewed? Yes _____ No _____

Subjects of teachers interviewed _____

1) Assume it was necessary for you to describe this student and your feelings about him to another teacher or counselor. How would you describe him (her)? What kind of a person do you think this student is?

(NOTE: Try to get as much out of this unstructured question as possible - e.g., follow up all leads in an attempt to find what are the student's outstanding characteristics; attempt to get everyone to contribute to this description; etc.)

2) Motivation - Would you call this student a motivated student? How? In what way?

3) Work Habits - What would you say about _____'s work habits? Does he (she) assume responsibility for her work? Are assignments completed and handed in promptly? Etc.

4) Maturity - Generally, how mature an adolescent do you think _____ is?

(NOTE: Do not offer any definition of maturity, but let them define it as they wish. If not covered spontaneously, attempt to get at such things as the student's general sense of responsibility, his independence, and social maturity.)

5) Reactions of Others - What are the reactions of other people to _____? What feelings of respect, admiration, liking, etc. are evoked in others by this student?

Taking peers first. - Is he (she) well liked? respected? a leader?

How about teachers? - Is he (she) the kind of youngster a teacher likes to have in class? Do teachers genuinely like and enjoy him (her)? Do they respect this student? Etc.